[Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

THE

Nonconformist.

THE DISSIDENCE OF DISSENT AND THE PROTESTANTISM OF THE PROTESTANT RELIGION.

Vol. XXXIII.—New Series, No. 1389. LONDON: THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1872. Price { WITH SUPPLEMENT } UNSTAMPED.....5d. STAMPED .....5½d.

CONTENTS.

Ecclesiastical Affairs:
The Debate on Mr. Miall's Motion 681
"The Occasional Sermons Bill" 682
Ecclesiastical Notes 682
Mr. Miall and the Church 683
Nonconformists and the Education Act 683
Mr. Robert Baxter on the Bennett Judgment 684
Religious and Denominational News 684
Colleges and Schools:
Cheshunt 685
Rotherham 685
University College 686
Northern Congregational School 686
Correspondence:
Nonconformists and the Education Question... 686
A Day in the Country... 686
Imperial Parliament:
The Property of the English Church Establishment 687
Leading Articles:
Summary 692
The Answer of the Commons to the Peers..... 692
Germany and the Papacy 693
The Success of the Arbitration 693
Men and Things in America 694
Mr. Miall's Motion.—The Division 697
The Press on Mr. Miall's Motion 698
Epitome of News 699
Miscellaneous 699
Births, Marriages, and Deaths 699
Bank of England 700
Markets 700
Supplement:
How it Strikes a Stranger 705
Literature:
"The Great Lone Land" 706
Recent Issues of Messrs. Clark 706
Brief Notices 707
Missionary Papers 708

Ecclesiastical Affairs.

THE DEBATE ON MR. MIALL'S MOTION.

It will not be expected that in these columns we should make any comment on the speech in which Mr. Miall introduced his motion on Tuesday evening, for a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the property and revenues appropriated to the use of the Church of England. Suffice it to say that he made no such "significant admission" as the *Times* imputes to him. It was not because there is no "popular feeling" in favour of disestablishment that it was desirable to bring forward this motion; but because it would be in the highest degree advantageous if the discussion between the representatives of this popular feeling and its opponents could be conducted on a basis of facts, authoritatively ascertained, and therefore acknowledged by both. The House, by the patient and candid attention which it gave to the arguments of the hon. gentleman, showed its sense of the seriousness and the growing urgency of the question which he raised. And if the inconvenience of the time at which the debate was brought on prevented as full and thorough a discussion as we should have liked to see, at least an opportunity was afforded to the supporters of the Establishment to show how ill-prepared their favourite institution is in their view to bear the light.

Mr. Leatham, who seconded the motion with his usual eloquence and force, made a telling exposure of the waste, extravagance, and ineffectiveness which, notwithstanding all attempts at reform, have characterised the administration of capitular property down to the present day. That revenues amounting to upwards of 300,000*l.* a year should be employed by corporations so generally useless as Cathedral Chapters, is, in these times when economy of the public wealth is acknowledged as a sacred duty, a damning fact, which no deductions for contributions made to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners can palliate or condone. Nor, in the face of this great abuse, can the identity of religion and justice be vindicated in the eyes of the struggling masses of our fellow-countrymen by the fact—on which Mr. Gladstone dwelt with so much complacency—that in the two cathedrals of the metropolis large congregations are gathered together during a portion of the year. Without making any demands upon national property for his support, Mr. Spurgeon gathers congregations as great, or greater, all the year round.

The speech of Mr. Hughes in moving his amendment was refreshing, both from the kindliness of heart and the amiable simplicity which it displayed. There can be no question as to his profound sincerity, his religious earnestness, or his desire to do justice to the facts of the case. But how such a man could calmly make the statement that "for thirty years voluntaryism has been going backwards and the Church going forwards," is, we confess, a question which causes us no little perplexity. Some light, however, is thrown upon the question when we find the curious mode in which the hon. gentleman calculates the rate of Nonconformist retrogression. He has discovered, it seems, that while 5,810 chapels had been licensed to various denominations between 1841 and 1850, in 1851, 1,413 had "disappeared." This is alarming. But let us mark the absurdity of the results in which we are landed. In 1851 the Census of Religious Worship showed that the attendants in Nonconformist churches about equalled in number the actual worshippers in the Established Church. Now, if during the previous ten years voluntaryism had been "going back" at the portentous pace which Mr. Hughes seems to think his figures indicate, in 1841 the Nonconformist congregations must have very considerably outnumbered those of the Established Church. Does Mr. Hughes seriously believe this? If this was really the case, it is a pity Nonconformists were not aware of it at the time. But worse remains behind. For "between 1851 and May, 1870, 2,401 more licensed chapels had disappeared." This is terrible: 3,814 chapels swallowed up in twenty years! There runs in our memory a rhyme echoed from childhood's years about some omnivorous monster who—

> Ate the church, he ate the steeple,
> He ate the priest, and all the people.

He must surely since that date have begotten a brood with a special appetite for chapels. But seriously Mr. Hughes, who is in many respects quite a man of his time, ought to be aware that the indestructibility of matter and the conservation of force are quite sufficient to explain the singular phenomenon. He seems to think that when a chapel disappears it is annihilated. He has no notion that by some sudden transformation, or after a chrysalis existence in some temporary form, it may burst forth afresh into a higher life, winged with new energies and transfigured by art. The Poultry Chapel has "disappeared," in Mr. Hughes' sense of the word; nor have the talented minister and his congregation any local habitation of their own; but in the course of a year or so, Mr. Hughes, should he happen to cross the Holborn Viaduct, may find ocular demonstration that the "disappearance" of a chapel, so far from being equivalent to annihilation, may possibly signify resurrection and larger life. Does the hon. gentleman really mean that the number of Nonconformist churches is smaller now than in 1841? If he does, why did he not say so? If he does not, we fail to see the bearing of his figures upon his assertion. The truth is, these figures are neither new nor important. Their real significance has been already explained in our columns, and next week we may take the trouble of explaining them again. There is much more in this good-humoured, but extremely old-fashioned speech, which invites our comment; but we will confine ourselves to one point, which is a favourite one with the Broad Church.

Mr. Hughes dislikes Nonconformist churches, because a man must "exercise volition" to get into them. He likes the Church of England because "an Englishman has to exercise an act of volition to get out of it." Now, of course, the member for Frome has a perfect right both to have his likes and dislikes, but we think that when he parades them before the House of Commons, they ought to have some meaning, and some intelligible bearing upon actual facts. Does he mean, then, seriously to tell us that the millions of our population who never enter a church from one year's end to another, are members of the Anglican communion because they have never by "an act of volition" gone out of it? If so, has Church communion any significance at all beyond the name? Take away the divinely inspired sympathy which of old in the Primitive Church bound heart to heart; take away the common faith; take away actual union in worship; take away any living sense of a common relationship to the Founder and Head of the Church—and what is that residual element so potent to maintain Church communion, that it overrides all moral and spiritual divergencies? Has the drunken costermonger, who beats in his wife's head with a poker, ever exercised "an act of volition" to get out of the Church of England? And is the mere absence of such a volition in a life stolid and dreary, varied only by brute impulses to sensuality and cruelty, a sufficient warrant for the wretch's communion with the English Church? Does not the Prayer-book teach us that in baptism the babe is made a child of God? And by whose "volition" is it that tens of thousands remain unbaptized? It is all very well for warm-hearted and imaginative gentlemen to bring to the hideous facts of English social life their own pet theories, and insist upon seeing them there, but we have not learned by subscription to impossible creeds the polite art of euphemism which tends to sophisticate and emasculate all religious sentiment. We venture to call things by their right names. And we maintain that however eminent and however well-meaning may be its authors, the perverse idea that the unbaptized, the unbelieving, the indifferent, the vicious, the brutalised can all be huddled into Church communion, from which it is impossible to free themselves save by an "act of volition" uniting them with some distinct external sect, is simply unmitigated nonsense. Equally irrelevant to actual fact is the assertion, which every newly-created ecclesiastical district contradicts, that voluntaryism fails in dealing with the needs of the masses. Its action is imperfect indeed, but had it not been for the purely voluntary devotion exhibited not only by Nonconformist societies, but also in new town parishes and district churches, the East of London and, indeed, all our great towns, would be as deeply sunk in heathenism as Central Africa.

We pass over Mr. Cubitt's interesting exposition of the indisputable fact that Free Churches possess private property, conferred upon them in trust for special purposes, the application to these purposes being guaranteed by the law. From the interest which his flowing discourse excited in the Opposition benches, we can only gather that Tories have been hitherto generally ignorant of this. We are glad that they should be enlightened, and we are bound to confess that the lesson was given in a pleasing and sprightly manner, such as would gain for any

elementary school teacher the high encomiums of the visiting inspector. But we cannot close without one word on the comparative levity with which Mr. Gladstone saw fit to treat the discussion of the evening. The Premier indeed could not be discourteous. It is not in him. And for the mover of the resolution personally, he expressed his respect in a manner which must have been gratifying. But when the Prime Minister of Great Britain tells the Nonconformists of England, and the whole population of Wales, that in discussing a practical subject which so large a number of Her Majesty's subjects and his own supporters take deeply to heart, the House of Commons is "discharging the functions of a debating society rather than the ordinary duties of the British Parliament," we cannot wonder if such a slight rouses a feeling which at the next election will show the matter at issue to be just the "burning question" of politics. Nor can we give any counsel but that of firm adherence to principle, at any expense of personal or party feeling. If in the House of Commons the argument for religious equality is treated as a debating game—a light interlude between more serious matters—it is time Nonconformists made up their minds that when next the polling-booths are open, they will show distinctly that they are in no trifling mood.

"THE OCCASIONAL SERMONS BILL."

PART of Wednesday morning's sitting of the House of Commons was occupied in the discussion of a bill brought in by Mr. Cowper-Temple, to enable other persons than those in holy orders in the Church of England to preach occasionally in her pulpits. It is to be presumed that Mr. Cowper-Temple and Mr. T. Hughes, whose names are at the back of the bill, were moved to attempt this slight modicum of relief from the fetters in which the State holds the Church by the discussion which was excited a short time since by the fact—in the judgment of some Churchmen a wonderful stretch of charity, and in that of others a dreadful laxity of principle—that the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Winchester had preached in Presbyterian pulpits. It is a very little bill, occupying, in fact, only thirty lines of print, of which ten are "preamble." The object of the bill, as stated in the preamble, was to remove existing doubts as to whether it is lawful, *i.e.*, consistent with the terms of "the Act of Uniformity" and "the Clerical Subscription Act," for anybody but an ordained Episcopal clergyman to preach in the pulpits of the Established Church. We should, probably, have felt no occasion to make any comments on such a proposal, whatever its fate, if Mr. Cowper-Temple had not, in his speech on introducing the bill, implied that its object was to enable Nonconformists to occupy the pulpits of the Established Church. For anything that is in the bill itself, we should have supposed that it merely aimed at allowing the laity occasionally to preach, whilst still restricting to the ordained clergy all sacramental and priestly functions. This, however, seems to be not the object of its authors. We must suppose, therefore, that its aim was to enable a clergyman of liberal sentiments and rare charity to invite now and then some eminent man of another section of the Church Catholic to occupy his pulpit for an occasional service. Certainly, on the score of Christian charity—over the "rarity" of which there is ample reason to moan—we must confess to a certain amount of sympathy with the measure. The sight of Mr. Binney in the pulpit of St. Paul's would, on the ground of Christian brotherliness, be a very pleasant one. It would be an indication that the haughty spirit of sect had begun a little to decline, and that the day of oneness for the disciples of our Lord was not so hopelessly distant as it has hitherto seemed. On any other ground than this we have no interest in this proposal. It might be of much service to the Church of England to be able to avail herself of the preaching talents of her own laymen or of the ministers of other denominations. Preaching has not been the "forte" of her clergy; and even to-day the percentage of her ministers who have the gift of teaching is by no means a large one. But we can assure Mr. Cowper-Temple and Mr. T. Hughes that the Nonconformists are not ambitious of the honour of preaching in the pulpits of the Establishment except on the score of Christian brotherhood, and then only on reciprocal terms.

But the first thing that strikes us about this bill is, the humiliating position of a Church which has to come to Parliament for permission to do so simple a thing, and after all to be refused. We have heard the upholders of Establishments deny that the Church is in bondage. Why, she cannot do even so simple an act of grace as to ask anybody outside her pale to do her the simplest of services without the sanction of the secular legislature. If this be not bondage, then there is no such thing in the world. All the other religious bodies in the land can do this thing as often as they please. As a matter of fact it is often done Wesleyans, Baptists, Presbyterians, Independents, are constantly exchanging services of this kind, much to their own advantage and to the promotion of brotherly love. But here is the greatest, wealthiest, strongest of all the Churches of Great Britain obliged to come and humbly sue Parliament for permission to do the same, and to be sent away only with the sensation that the cord of the law has been tightened on her neck. Surely this is no position for the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ to be placed in.

But if the bill had passed, it is doubtful if any good would have come of it; for we are fain to believe that there are very few Nonconformists who would have submitted to the condition of having to be licensed by the bishop of the diocese before they could be suffered to preach. We are tolerably certain that this would be the case among that section of the Nonconformists which we know most about. We are not much given to the licensing system. Our extreme freedom in the matter of teaching may have its disadvantages, but we are confident that its advantages immensely preponderate. And we are so used to this "glorious liberty," that to most Free Church ministers it would seem to be a humiliation, that they could not preach for a brother minister without obtaining an episcopal licence. Nothing but an earnest desire to break a hole in the fence of sectarianism, and to do a Christian service to a brother, would for an instant make Nonconformist pastors willing to tolerate a restriction like this—so contrary to the freedom they are accustomed to enjoy.

Again, this bill is altogether one-sided. It contains no provision for enabling an Established clergyman to reciprocate the service by preaching elsewhere than in a consecrated place. True, the thing has been done, and done by bishops; but for all that there is much doubt as to its strict legality. And as long as that doubt remains, and reciprocity is impossible, the Nonconformist is placed in this position—a clergyman can come and say to him, "Now; I will allow you to preach in my church, but I can't come and preach in yours. The law will tolerate you in my consecrated and established place, but will not tolerate me in your unconsecrated and only tolerated place." And as long as the law says that, the law itself utters once more that taunt of inferiority which is fatal to a true Christian charity. Even in the very act of opening a little wider the door of exclusiveness, it makes the exclusiveness more patent and offensive. The bill met with but scant favour from Churchmen in the House. Mr. Newdegate of course recoiled from it with pious horror. His imagination conjured up a vision which was certainly calculated considerably to alarm a Churchman of his type. He saw in vision no less a personage than the Pope, mounting the pulpit, say of Westminster, on the invitation of that very charitable gentleman, the Dean, and holding forth an "occasional," no doubt in the interests of the Papacy. Nor was this all. He saw also a whole troop of mendicant friars, black, white, and grey, Benedictine, Cistercian, Capuchin, coming to take possession of the pulpits of the Established Church, and preach all the congregations back to Rome. Nay, worse than this—if anything can be worse—in the estimation of Mr. Newdegate, he saw a vision of a black face in the sacred box. No! not he of the cloven foot, but a "learned Mohammedan or Brahmin." Mr. Henley asked, in a tone of piteous distress, "What would be the feelings excited in a parish if Archbishop Manning or Mr. Spurgeon were invited to preach?" Ah! what indeed? Most fearful to contemplate! For Giles and Hodge and the rest for once to listen to *preaching*, and possibly institute most irreverent and unpleasant contrasts between preaching and "sermons" would indeed be intolerable. Mr. Scourfield seemed to be suffering from a severe attack of sermoniphobia, declaring that his sympathies were with the congregations, whom he seemed to rank in the class of sufferers, and hinted that the proper function of preachers was to go about and preach to the convicts as part of their penal servitude. So the bill was rejected, and we are not sorry for it. But if the Church wants to have the power to do such things as this without the humiliation of asking Parliament and being refused, we humbly suggest that there *is* a way—and a price.

ECCLESIASTICAL NOTES.

WE are glad—nay, we are thankful—to see, that there are some members of the Evangelical party who have not allowed themselves to be imposed upon by the sophistries of their brethren. There are men who feel that they have not gained a "substantial victory," but have endured a heavy defeat. While the *Record*, and Dr. McNeile, and others have been trying to explain everything away, and have been writing column after column to convince themselves—but nobody else—the Rev. Capel Molyneux comes forward to dispel those "clouds and illusions." In a letter to the *Times* of Thursday, Mr. Molyneux shows that he, at any rate, appreciates the gravity of the recent judgment. We quite agree with him as to its effect:—

> The doctrine of the real and actual and visible presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine, with the adoration due to the same—the very doctrine substantially for the denial of which our Reformers went to the stake—the very doctrine against which we as a Church absolutely protest, and for which we are called Protestants—the very doctrine which we Protestants hold to be beyond others perilous to souls, and dishonourable to our Lord—this very doctrine is now pronounced by the highest judicial authority in England not to be excluded by the Articles and laws of our Church, and is, therefore, legalised as a doctrine that may with perfect impunity be taught in our pulpits by any clergyman at any time, and in any place, when and where he chooses and has opportunity to do so!

Mr. Molyneux says that this places the Church in an "evil condition and perilous circumstances." He writes strongly, but with scarcely too great strength:—

> Heresy is a part and parcel now of our Church Constitution; heresy to be disseminated as men will, and when men will, and abundant advantage will be taken of the liberty. Blind as some of us may be to what has befallen us, not so our adversaries. Ritualists and Romanists know full well the point they have gained, and how to profit and push their cause by means of it; and our eyes will be opened, and we shall discover it too, if we will only quietly accept our position, and, as some would seemingly counsel, sit down and let them alone. Yes, it needs no prophet then to foretell the issue. Ichabod is written on our Church. Her doom is inevitable. She will break up and go to pieces.

Mr. Molyneux proceeds to ask the Protestants of England to help the Church, and so on, but admits that he does not know how she can be helped.

Mr. Ryle also is full of fear. There is, he thinks, a broad, awkward fact which cannot be explained away and which he cannot digest comfortably—namely that a beneficed clergyman may use Mr. Bennett's language, and teach Mr. Bennett's doctrine, and nobody can say that he transgresses the law of the Church. He thinks that this will have a bad effect on the character of the Church in the eyes of Christendom, and that it will disgust and disappoint laymen. Upon this point Mr. Ryle remarks,—

> Not a few of them will say, "Where is the use of supporting an Established Church which allows her clergy to teach the two diametrically opposite doctrines about the Lord's Supper?" The laity of a Church have a right to be considered as well as the clergy, and if the recent decision does not offend and alienate many of our best laymen, I shall be greatly surprised. This, again, is an immense evil.

But even Mr. Ryle cannot decide what to do, only he does decide not to secede. Mr. Moncrieff, on the other hand, says that if the Evangelical clergy submit to the judgment, "it is the beginning of the end of the Church of England." Mr. Hudson, vicar of Dodworth, says that "with such a millstone round its neck the Church must sink." Archdeacon Allen regards it as a disaster, but advises that it be accepted "in silence," while Mr. Robert Baxter, in a letter which we transfer to our columns this week, writes in the plainest language on the whole case. Our readers will see that Mr. Baxter looks at the judgment as going altogether against the Evangelical party, while he asks whether the Church can now be called Protestant, and predicts the withdrawal from its pale of "tens of thousands of its most energetic members." "Congregation," he says, "after congregation will desert, and the popular feeling, now disgusted, will become actively antagonistic, and give the cry for the overthrow of the Establishment." These opinions will show that, notwithstanding all that has been written the other way, there is a great ferment in some men's minds. But no one need be surprised that the way of duty is not at present clear. The only way that may ultimately open up, may be a painful one, and the most conscientious of men may well hesitate before taking it. What is most satisfactory in these expressions is the admitted fact that there is, undoubtedly, a great crisis in the Church, and that mere sitting still will not avert it.

We have referred elsewhere to the debate on the Occasional Sermons Bill. We are indebted to the

Christian World for a description of a conference at Willis's Rooms, on Monday of last week, in anticipation of the second reading, between several Evangelical clergymen and Nonconformist ministers. It is stated that about sixty gentlemen of influential position belonging to various denominations were present. Lord Ebury took the chair, and amongst those who took part in the proceedings were Canon Battersby, Dr. Stoughton, Mr. Cowper-Temple, the Rev. S. Minton, the Rev. Gordon Calthrop, the Rev. W. Braden, the Rev. Donald Fraser, Lord Alfred Churchill, and Dr. Blackwood. Mr. Minton, in the course of the proceedings, suggested, with a view to practical action, and, of course, anticipating the defeat of the bill, that three clergymen should, on the same Sunday, occupy three Nonconformist pulpits. Dr. Stoughton thereupon suggested that the number should be twelve, and then it was suggested by Mr. Braden that on the same day twelve Dissenting ministers should also occupy pulpits belonging to the Established Sect. Some offers were made in both directions, and ultimately it was agreed to report the proceedings to the Evangelical Alliance, at whose instance the meeting was called. The gist of the whole seems to us to be that, for the sake of attaining their object, certain persons are prepared to break the law, hoping, thereby, to break it down. We can understand how, with their convictions, Nonconformists should be prepared to do this, but how clergymen who have taken certain ordination vows can do it is another question.

Lord Shaftesbury may be said to have achieved a success in the matter of the lay declaration against the Athanasian Creed. More than five thousand signatures have been sent to him, some of them from men of considerable social and intellectual eminence. This, we believe, is the first time that the laity, as such, have been arrayed against the clergy as such, but the probability is that it will not be the last time. Lord Shaftesbury has evoked a power, and with it, possibly, a consciousness of power, which may work far greater reforms than that appertaining to the one of the Athnasian Creed. What do the laity care for in the constitution of the Established Church? If you talk with them, you will find as a rule they care nothing; but if you organise them, you may find an active disposition to do away with a great deal that the clergy might feel disposed to save.

There is a curious discussion going on in some of the Church journals as to the liberty of non-communicants to stay while the communion service is being celebrated. As is usual, a large draught has been made upon the writings of the "Fathers" on this question, and with the usual result, viz., that no new light is to be got from them. There are two parties in this controversy. One wishes to exclude the non-communicants; the other wishes to give them permission to remain. A new rubric has been suggested by the Ritual Commissioners, the effect of which would be to exclude the non-communicants. But, as the Rev. J. C. Chambers writes to the *Guardian*,—

> I am not unmindful of what Mr. Freeman says about the withdrawal of notorious sinners. But since the cessation of that ancient discipline, which the Church has so long yearned for, the Church has been unable to provide for this contingency. Certainly the crowds which are often seen turning away after being dismissed with special benedictions would be far from allowing that they were *pro hac vice* cut off from the Church.

No: these crowds are "not cut off from the Church"—they simply indicate how many real Church people there are.

We quote the following from the *Liberator*, concerning the defeat of the Burials Bill, referred to in the Summary of last week:—

> What the opponents of the Burials Bill could not do by numerical strength they have effected by a trick. The bill was down for the evening of Tuesday, the 25th of June, when there was just a chance that further progress might be made in committee. The day sitting, and the length of the discussions on the motions which preceded, made it evident, in the course of the evening, that there must be a further postponement, and at half-past one in the morning, Mr. Morgan moved that the committee be postponed till the 9th of July, and stated that, if he failed to bring it on then, he would withdraw it for the session. Opposition to such a motion is so rare as to be almost unprecedented. The opponents of the bill, however, proposed a postponement to the 3rd of September, when the session will be over, and, having kept together to ensure the success of the plot, they succeeded in carrying their point by 130 to 78 votes. Practically, this result of, what the Home Secretary called, "a well-arranged plan," is the same as would have followed had the majority been the other way, since it had become evident that the bill could not be carried through the Commons this session. This incident, however, brings with it a lesson which will, we hope, be conned over to advantage during the recess.

We publish in another column an exhaustive analysis of the division list on Mr. Miall's motion. It will well bear a careful examination, for it shows a very considerable advance on the vote of last year. While the number of members supporting the hon. member for Bradford is not greatly in excess of those who followed him on the occasion of his previous motion, the number of his opponents has greatly diminished. Indeed, if this motion should be often repeated, and with a similar result, Mr. Miall would apparently find few opponents left. The majority against him appears to be dissolving. There are now 128 members of the present House of Commons who have voted in favour of a policy of disestablishment and disendowment.

MR. MIALL AND THE CHURCH.

The following letter appeared in the *Spectator* of Saturday:—

"Sir,—As you have admitted two letters signed 'Gilbert Venables,' will you allow me a few words in reply? Knowing that your space is both valuable and limited, I am very reluctant to trench upon it, more especially as I desire rather to deal with what is somewhat personal in the letters referred to than with that which concerns questions of public policy.

"In the first place, Mr. Venables says that Mr. Miall, 'after inviting the world any day for these thirty years past to view "the dark polluted chamber of which the Established Church is the door," and see the "loathsome things that live, and crawl, and gender there," has found it necessary,' &c. The evident object of these quotations is to suggest that Mr. Miall is in the habit of speaking of the Established Church in this style. It is clear, however, that Mr. Venables is aware that these sentences are extracted from the 'Nonconformist's Sketch-Book,' published nearly 'thirty years' ago; and I dare say he equally well knows that in self-defence the author published a new edition of that work some two years since, with a preface, in which he admits that 'much' in the book 'has become inapplicable in the present day,' and adds—

> Were he called upon in his maturer age by sense of duty to go over afresh the same lines of thought, his disposition would incline him to bear himself more gently, and in a somewhat more modest, kindly, charitable spirit, than he did when he was a controversial novice. In regard to both taste and temper, there are many phrases and several passages in the book which he could wish had never been written, and more particularly those which apply to large bodies of men rather than to the systems with which they are associated.

"Need I point out that Mr. Venables either should not have quoted the above extracts, or in fairness have given some explanation as to their source? Notwithstanding Mr. Miall's disclaimer, these and a score more of isolated passages are, at the present moment, made to do duty in discrediting the author by professional Church defenders.

"Secondly, with your customary desire to act justly by an opponent, you express your belief that Mr. Miall had publicly expressed his opinion 'very carefully' that, in case of disestablishment, the Church of England should be generously dealt with. Mr. Venables instantly seizes the opportunity of again playing the game of the *suggestio falsi*. Will you allow me to supply what you required a fortnight ago, by quoting Mr. Miall's own language as it appeared in a published letter, signed with his own name, and circulated far and wide with a view to meet the misrepresentations of his political foes? This is what Mr. Miall said on Feb. 14 of the present year:—

> I never in my life contemplated even a remote possibility, detaching from the Church of England, as such, any of the churches built, or any of the endowments given, out of private resources, since the period of the Toleration Act. I have again and again, both on the platform and in the press, explained that, in my view of what is equitable, these modern buildings and endowments belong of right to the Church of England, and ought not to be separated from it. With regard to ancient parish churches, I think, and have always thought, that they are truly national property, and may be dealt with by the Legislature as such; but I have uniformly contended for a generous and indulgent consideration of the congregations who have worshipped therein. But I have never desired that they should be alienated from religious uses or from the performance of Divine worship. Whatever representations, therefore, have been made to a contrary effect, may be taken as essentially untrue.

This was written in reference to the Leicester speech, already freely quoted by your correspondent, and also to a foregoing correspondence with the Rev. George Venables, of Leicester, who was reported by the Nottingham papers at the last Church Congress, erroneously, he says, to have attributed to Mr. Miall a proposition to convert all Church edifices into 'music-halls' or 'dancing-saloons.' As to the Leicester speech itself, Mr. Miall admits that there is 'some ambiguity' in the passage quoted, but declares that what he meant was 'that the ecclesiastical property lying within the parish should, so far as it was national, become vested in the parish for non-ecclesiastical purposes,' though subsequent reflection has led him to think 'that in practice it might be attended with insuperable difficulties.'

"My object in thus taxing your space is to show what are Mr. Miall's real views on the question, as expressed by himself, apart from your correspondent's ingenious glosses and partisan suggestions—a task I should not have thought of attempting, but for his position as a public man. It will no doubt be a great comfort to the Established Church that Mr. Gilbert Venables is going 'to pin Mr. Miall to his present position.' But before he constitutes himself as the champion of the Church, may I be allowed to suggest that he will in the end acquire more moral influence if he fairly meets the fair arguments of opponents? Is Mr. Miall really so formidable an antagonist that he cannot be encountered in a straightforward fashion?

"I am, Sir, &c.,
"FAIR PLAY."

NONCONFORMISTS AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

SMETHWICK.—On Monday evening a public meeting was held at the Public Hall, Smethwick, for purpose of considering the question of national education, and to form a society of Nonconformists to protect the interests and promote the objects of the party, particularly in reference to the question of national education. Mr. R. Tangye presided. The principal speakers were Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and the Rev. J. J. Brown, who were a deputation from the Central Nonconformist Committee, Birmingham. After a brief address by the chairman, Mr. Chamberlain moved the following resolution:—

> That in the opinion of this meeting, the principles of justice and religious equality require that in any national system of education the school board and the State should make provision solely for the secular instruction which all children may receive in common, and that the responsibility of the religious education in each district should rest with the parent and the churches, to whom it has been divinely committed.

In the course of his speech Mr. Chamberlain said it appeared to him that Nonconformist principles had suffered under the present Government. (Hear, hear.) The English Education Act had been passed; a Scotch Act, based on very much the same principle, had gone to the House of Lords, and would probably be passed during the next session. There was nothing more certain than that those two must be followed by an Irish Education Act, and that Act must also be based on the same principle, for "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." (Laughter.) If so, they would have school boards elected in Ireland with authority to compel attendance, and to provide for religious instruction in the schools. These school boards would consist almost entirely of Roman Catholics; and the result would be that the Roman Catholic religion would be taught, and very largely, at the expense of the English people. (Hear, hear.) Were they satisfied with that? or would they support doctrines against which their forefathers protested so strongly? ("No.") They could not trust the Church of England in this question, because it had been bought and sold; it had made itself an accomplice with the Roman Catholics. They must, however, be prepared to take up the matter, and fight the battle with clean hands. The Government had made its choice, and had chosen a system of concurrent endowment, in spite of all the opposition previously shown by the Nonconformists of this country to that system. The effect of such a system was always the advantage of the strongest sect or party. But the friends of the Ministry said their intentions were honourable. He did not look at intentions; he looked at facts. The fact was this—the majority, who enjoyed endowments amounting to 10,000,000*l.* a year, had had those endowments increased to the extent of perhaps 500,000*l.* or 1,000,000*l.* a year. The whole policy of the friends of the bill seemed to have been the old one—"To him that hath much, more shall be given." Notwithstanding all their prejudices, they would have been perfectly satisfied with any honest attempt to supplement the present system. He dwelt upon the great zeal shown by Church of England ministers since the passing of the Act in erecting schools in every parish, and doing their utmost to prevent the ratepayers from having a voice in the question of education. On the authority of the Monthly Paper of the National Education Society, he stated that no less than half a million a year would be taken out of the pockets of all the inhabitants, Nonconformists and Churchmen alike, to support schools in which children would be taught to be Churchmen, and not Dissenters—to be taught the reasons why they should go to church, and not to chapel. He said the public purse would thus be degraded into a proselytising agency; their money would be taken from them in order to teach them that they were heretics and spiritual outcasts. (Applause.) They, as Nonconformists, went in for the separation of secular from religious instruction in their schools. The senior member for Birmingham, the Right Hon. John Bright—(applause)—had written to a friend, and had expressed his entire opposition to the spirit of the English Education Act. He said the evil clauses in the bill were partly adopted through the want of union amongst the Liberals. He (Mr. Chamberlain) had made up his mind not to give 6d. or to say a word in support of any man at the next election who would not pledge himself to support the Manchester platform, which simply meant religious equality. (Applause.) The Rev. T. W. May seconded the resolution, which was carried almost unanimously. The Rev. J. J. Brown then moved—

> That this meeting, believing that the educational policy of Her Majesty's Government is inimical to the interests of religious freedom, and viewing with the greatest apprehension the probable application to Ireland of the same policy, pledges itself not to vote for any candidate for the House of Commons who will not support the principles embodied in the previous resolution.

He said he was a Christian minister, and had spent the better part of his life in attempting to propagate Christian truth. He had very clear and well-defined

religious views, and he held those truths with the greatest possible moral tenacity, and he did not think there was any position in which he could be placed in which he could be induced to sacrifice his views. He wanted to proclaim those truths as clearly and as well-defined as he held them; but he did not want to proclaim them at the expense of any man who differed from him, and he would not tolerate the promulgation of any other man's religious views at his expense. (Applause.) He held it right that every parent should teach his children what religion he thought proper, but it was not right to do so except at his own expense. They did not pretend that they should be satisfied with a national system of education, for as long as the State Church remained, so long would injustice and wrong be perpetrated against them. (Applause.) It had been said they were dividing the great Liberal party. His answer to that was that they should never divide the party. When that party departed from its principles it simply left them, and they remained where they formerly were. They could not be a party to an organisation of hypocrisy, which had Liberalism on its lips, and did not show Liberalism in its votes. (Applause.) Addresses were also delivered by the Revs. A. S. Wright and A. M. Dalrymple, and it was resolved to form a local Nonconformist Association.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—A local Nonconformist committee having been recently formed here, a meeting was held on Friday to discuss the education policy of the Government. The meeting was well attended by representatives from nearly every Nonconformist congregation in the town. The Rev. H. W. Crosskey and Mr. F. Schnadhorst attended as a deputation from the Central Nonconformist Committee. The Rev. Mr. Booth presided, and, after a short address by the Rev. J. P. Tetley, the Rev. H. W. Crosskey delivered an eloquent and stirring address, and a resolution was unanimously passed, expressing approval of the principles of the Central Nonconformist Committee. After an address by Mr. Schnadhorst, a second resolution was proposed pledging the meeting not to vote for any candidate who would not support the platform of the Manchester Conference. A lengthy and animated discussion took place, but the resolution was ultimately enthusiastically passed with only five dissentients. The towns of Smethwick and Burton are in the constituency of East Staffordshire. A committee has also been formed at West Bromwich, so that the organisation of Nonconformity in this constituency is now most complete and effective.

At a meeting of the Nonconformist Committee, Cottenham, held June 25, the subjoined resolution was passed:—

That in the opinion of this meeting the Education Act of 1870, especially Clause 7, contains provisions which violate the principle of religious equality, and impede the development of a truly national system of education.

At the usual monthly meeting of the Sussex County Association, held in the vestry of Union-street Chapel, Brighton, July 1, 1872, the Rev. Henry Quick in the chair, the following resolution was passed unanimously, viz.—

That this meeting protests against rates levied by public authorities being applied to pay the fees of children attending sectarian schools, as a violation of those principles of freedom from all State interference in matters of conscience and religion for which Nonconformists have hitherto so often contended and suffered, and for the maintenance of which they are still resolved strenuously to labour.

MR. ROBERT BAXTER ON THE BENNETT JUDGMENT.

The following remarkable letter, which has appeared in the *Record*, is from the pen of Mr. Robert Baxter, a gentleman well known for his liberal support of Church institutions, missionary agencies, and the Protestant cause. Mr. Baxter is a representative man. Though it does not appear that many of the Evangelical clergy share his views, they probably reflect those of thousands of earnest Protestant laymen who are members of the Establishment:—

Sir,—At last the blow is struck. It is authoritatively declared in the words of the official printed judgment—

1. That maintaining (as Mr. Bennett does, page 11) "A presence (of Christ) which is real—objective—a presence in the Sacrament—a presence upon the altar under the form of bread and wine," and explaining (as Mr. Bennett does, page 17) "Under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," their lordships declare (page 11), "We find nothing in the Articles and Formularies to which the respondent's (Mr. Bennett) position is contradictory or repugnant."

This is the judgment, even though their lordships (page 11) lay it down, "Any presence which is not a presence to the soul of a faithful receiver, the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies require her ministers to accept. This cannot be stated too plainly. The question, however, is—not what the Articles or Formularies affirm, but what they exclude."

The inevitable inference from this is that if our Articles have most plainly set forth the truth, but have failed to condemn the particular form of error by which an heresiarch contradicts this truth, he will escape condemnation! Can this be sound reasoning?

This judgment on "the Real Presence" affirms in effect that a clergyman may teach consubstantiation without infringing our Articles or Formularies.

2. That maintaining (as Mr. Bennett does, p. 14) "That the Communion Table is an altar of sacrifice at which the priest appears in a sacerdotal position at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and at such celebration there is a great sacrifice or offering of our Lord by the ministering priest in which the mediation of our Lord ascends from the altar to plead for the sins of men," their lordships declare (p. 15), "The Church of England does not by her Articles or Formularies teach or affirm the doctrine maintained by the respondent" (Mr. Bennett).

Moreover the judgment adds, (p. 15) "It is not lawful for a clergyman to teach the sacrifice or offering of Christ upon the cross, or the redemption, propitiation, or satisfaction wrought by it can be repeated in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper—nor that in that ordinance there is or can be any offering of Christ which is efficacious, in the sense in which Christ's death is efficacious, to procure the remission of the guilt or punishment of sins."

Yet (notwithstanding their lordships thus decide that Mr. Bennett is teaching what the Church of England does not affirm, and that it is unlawful to say the sacrifice of Christ can be repeated, which Mr. Bennett says), Mr. Bennett is still absolved in the words of the judgment, (p. 16) "It is not clear to their lordships that the respondent has so used the word 'sacrifice' as to contradict the language of the Articles."

The judgment therefore decides that to call the communion table an altar of sacrifice, and to affirm that at the communion there is a great sacrifice or offering of our Lord by the ministering priest, does not contradict the teaching of our Articles.

That Mr. Bennett's declaration in his last edition (p. 17), "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the sacrament under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred body and blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," even whilst the judges declare (p. 19) "That the Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements," only evokes this judgment (p. 19), "Their lordships, not without doubt and division of opinion, have come to the conclusion, that as this charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require, Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt which may exist," and he is therefore acquitted.

On this article the judges also add (p. 19), with an inconceivable subtlety of reasoning, "Even if the respondent's words are a confession of an unlawful act, it is questionable whether such a confession would amount to false doctrine."

And again they say (p. 19), "Some of their lordships have doubted whether the word 'adore,' though it seems to point to acts of worship such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration or prayer, addressed to Christ spiritually present in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements, or of any corporeal or natural presence therein."

What is the subtlety of logic which distinguishes between "mental adoration" and "acts of adoration" which their lordships hold to be unlawful (p. 19)?

Illogical and contradictory as the language of the judgment undoubtedly is, the effect of the judgment itself is painfully plain, viz.:—That Mr. Bennett, and those who think with him, may teach the principles of Popery (as Mr. Bennett himself states them (page 17)—(1.) "The real objective presence of our blessed Lord himself in the Eucharist. (2.) The sacrifice offered by the priest, and (3.) The adoration due to the presence of our blessed Lord therein," within our Church as not inconsistent with our articles and formularies.

It is true there is nothing in the judgment to forbid sound-minded Churchmen protesting against such doctrines and teaching the truth of Christ's presence not in the elements or on the altar, but in the souls communicating—Christ's one sacrifice once made and never to be repeated, and the adoration of Christ, not in any elements or on altar, but at the right hand of the Father in the glory.

But if the Articles of the Protestant Church are authoritatively held to allow the principles of Popery to be taught within it, is that Church any longer to be called Protestant? and if not Protestant, by what right or title does the Church hold her present position?

A Church is a community bound together by a common faith. But if the articles embodying this faith are so interpreted as to allow Protestant truth and Popish error to be equally taught, the bond of Church union is gone.

We hear much of "free thought" and "wide comprehension"—very pretty phrases no doubt—but when "free thought" condescends to Church membership it embodies its freedom in articles of faith, which it may freely profess, but is no longer free to deny.

"Wide comprehension" even has limits, and if it is proposed to comprise in one and the same Church the profession and contradiction of the same doctrines our comprehension is aghast.

A judgment which reasons one way and decides another cannot carry much weight, but still it is a judgment, which, if it were maintained on a rehearing of the subject formally raised, must be fatal to the Church.

This decision, so long as it stands, establishes as a fact that Popery, without disguise, may be lawfully taught in the Church of England. This fact will evoke two consentaneous movements: one, the withdrawal from the pale of tens of thousands of its most attached and energetic members, who yet subordinate their love for the Church to their faithfulness to Christ's pure Word and doctrine; the other, the opposition of the great body of the people throughout the land, who will never consent to the maintenance of a Church which, under the name of Protestantism, is allowed to teach Popery. In the face of the attack from without for disestablishment and disendowment how can any defence be maintained if, from within, there is desertion and rebellion.

The crisis is very perilous; and if the true friends of the Church sit down in the expectation that something will arise from those in authority for her deliverance, the worst consequences must result. The Romanising party, legalised in their movements, will press on with redoubled vigour, and extend their imitations of Rome to parishes where they have hitherto not dared to introduce them. Congregation after congregation will rebel and desert, and the popular feeling, now disgusted, will become actively antagonistic, and join the cry for the overthrow of the Establishment.

Nothing can save the Church but the reversal of the judgment, which must be sought by a fresh appeal upon an analogous case of Romanising practices, and by demanding that the Judges of the Court of Appeal shall not be again practically selected by one who, however honourable and high-minded, is yet known to sympathise with their opinions.

Meanwhile, meetings should be held and a solemn protest made by the clergy and laity of the Church, that the doctrines of the Real Presence in the elements, of the priestly offering of Christ in the Communion, and of the adoration of the elements as containing under "their veil the sacred Body and Blood of Jesus," are deemed by them to be utterly repugnant to the Articles and Formularies, and to be doctrines which, in their conscience, they cannot profess, believing them to be the apostate views of the Church of Rome.

The issue is most momentous. Whether the Church of England shall be maintained as a beacon for the truth, and a standing protest equally against superstition and infidelity; or whether she shall be surrendered to superstitious doctrines and practices because a judgment, which reasons against, and decides in favour of, Romish opinions, has opened its doors to superstition.

To surrender the Church to the Romanising school would be at once unfaithful and cowardly. The judgment of the Privy Council may be reversed, and, even if the worst should happen, and the Supreme Court refuse to condemn the heresy, and maintain the spirit of her pure and Scriptural Articles, the great body of Churchmen should unite to demand a Convocation composed of clergy and laity, to which, as in all our colonial churches, the government of the Church and the adjudication of doctrines should be committed.

It is true that the most valued members of our Church shrink from public action, lest they should be accused of undue agitation. But in this crisis inaction is death. The judgment legalises a return to Romish doctrine, and the Church, which should harbour the very Papal teaching against which it protested, and came out, and was established to warn the nation, would justly forfeit the confidence of the people.

Yours faithfully,
ROBERT BAXTER.

10, Queen-square, Westminster, June 17, 1872.

PUBLIC BODIES ON MR. MIALL'S MOTION.—At the annual assembly of the representatives of the United Free Gospel Churches (about seventy in number), held at Liverpool June 18th and 19th, 1872, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

That this assembly again records its fealty to the principles of religious liberty, and its protest against the connexion of Church and State. The assembly has learned with satisfaction of the important motion to be brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Miall, M.P., for a royal commission of inquiry into the origin of Church property. That motion has the hearty concurrence of the representatives present, who trust that Her Majesty's Government will accord to it their influential support.

That in the opinion of this assembly the 25th section of the Elementary Education Act, which allows the payment of school fees to denominational schools out of the public rates, places an unjust power in the hands of school boards to compel one section of the community to support, directly or indirectly, the creeds of others; that it thus violates the principles of religious liberty, and produces great jealousy, bitterness, and strife; that it contains the false principle of taxation without oversight and control; and that for these reasons the 25th section ought to be unconditionally repealed; and that this resolution be forwarded to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and the Right Hon. W. E. Forster.

The following resolution was adopted by the Nonconformist Committee at Cottenham, held last week:—

That this meeting desires to record its entire sympathy with Mr. Miall's motion for an inquiry into the revenues of the Establishment, their origin and legal status.

Religious and Denominational News.

Mr. J. Foster Lepine, of New College, London, has accepted a unanimous invitation to become senior minister of the Congregational Church, Hadleigh, Suffolk.

BRIXTON INDEPENDENT CHURCH.—Last Sunday being the anniversary of the opening of this church, the Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, the minister, preached morning and evening, and collections were made in aid of the building fund. From Mr. Brown's statement at the close of each sermon it appeared that the entire cost of the land and building was 14,000*l.*, of which 8,000*l.* had been received when the church was opened. This left a formidable debt, but being determined to keep up Clayland's Chapel, they had made a great effort to reduce the deficit on the completion of the pastor's wenty-fifth year of ministry two years ago. During the past year 1,650*l.* had been received, and there was still more to come in, and 1,500*l.* had been actually paid off the debt, reducing it to 4,500*l.* The interest on this was 112*l.* 50*l.* had been received, and they wished to collect the balance, 62*l.*, that day. Interest on 800*l.* had been raised by means of the lectures given by himself, and he thought they might rejoice in what had been done in the past (which he considered a striking illustration of the power of the voluntary principle) and look forward hopefully to the future.

BUCKHURST-HILL, EPPING.—The recognition services in connection with the settlement of the Rev. W. H. Charlesworth as pastor of the Buckhurst-hill Congregational Church, were held on Wednesday, 26th June. The Rev. Dr. Kennedy, chairman of the Congregational Union, the Rev. Dr. Thomas, editor of the *Homilist*, &c., &c.; the Rev. T. G. Horton, of Wolverhampton, the Rev. E. T. Egg, of Woodford, the Rev. James Knaggs, of Stratford, the Rev. C. Dukes, M.A., of Dalston, the Rev. H. T. Bevis, of Ramsgate, the Rev. T. B. Talbot, of West Ham, Messrs. Westhorp, Fraser, and Halsey,

deacons of the church, and Mr. John Lester, from the pastor's former church at Wolverhampton, took part. There were also present the Rev. John Curwen, the Rev. Morgan Lloyd, of Leyton, the Rev. V. T. Charlesworth, of Stockwell Orphanage, and other representative friends. A great number of letters were received from ministers and other friends, far and near, expressive of earnest sympathy and regret at being unable to attend. The whole of the proceedings were of a remarkably pleasing and harmonious character, and great hopes are cherished as to the future.

SURBITON.—Last week the sixth anniversary of the opening of Surbiton Park Church was celebrated by special services and a public meeting. On Sunday, June 23, the Rev. A. Mackennal, of Leicester, one of the former ministers of the church, conducted the services, and at a devotional meeting the next evening the Rev. J. Hart, of Guildford, gave an address, in which he urged the congregation to apply themselves to home missionary work in the county of Surrey. On the Thursday following there was a numerous tea and public meeting in the lecture-hall, which was elegantly decorated with flowers for the occasion. Mr. Carvell Williams, who presided, sketched the history of the Congregational church in Surbiton, which commenced about nineteen years ago with a meeting of three persons, in the parlour of the Rev. R. H. Smith, the first minister. Next, a congregation was gathered in a wooden room in that gentleman's garden, and then a small church was built. That proving inadequate, the present commodious and handsome edifice was erected; the minister at that time being Mr. Mackennal. It cost 6,962*l.*, and opened with a debt of 3,267*l.*, instalments of which had since been paid, and they had now met to celebrate the raising of the entire sum. The congregation had proceeded in the same tentative way in regard to schools—first gathering the children in a workshop, then in a wooden room, and lastly in the old church, which was now one of the best halls in the county. Altogether, the congregation, though not twenty years old, had carried on its operations in six places—each change being an improvement—had raised 10,500*l.* for building purposes, and for those and all other objects, at least 17,000*l.* That result the chairman attributed to the energy, the liberality, and the harmony with which they had worked, and also to the confidence which had always been reposed in the executive. Mr. G. F. Dickinson, the treasurer, then made a detailed financial statement, showing how much had been raised, year by year, to pay off the debt, and giving the names of the contributors. He concluded by stating, amid loud cheers, that the whole sum required to pay off the mortgage was now lodged in the Bank of England. Addresses of singular interest were then delivered by the Rev. R. H. Smith and the Rev. A. Mackennal, the former, and by the Rev. W. Jones, the present minister the speakers combining with interesting personal reminiscences weighty reflections and practical exhortations. Resolutions of thanks to Messrs. Smith and Mackennal for their attendance, to Messrs. Dickinson and Carvell Williams, the treasurer and secretary to the building committee, and to the ladies who had provided the tea and decorated the hall, were next proposed; the Rev. G. Ingram, of Richmond, and the Rev. G. Blinkhorn, of Kingston, being among the speakers. During the evening some pieces of sacred music were sung by the choir. Several ministers of the county were present.

Colleges and Schools.

CHESHUNT.

One of the most interesting religious anniversaries is the festival of Cheshunt College. The genius of the institution, the beauty of the spot, and the usually attractive list of engagements provided for the visitors by the managers, all combine to make the day of this gathering one marked by the red letter in the calendar of Nonconformists. The 104th anniversary, which was celebrated on Thursday last, was not at all behind its predecessors. There were the interesting services of the day; there was the bright and happy crowd; there was the dinner in the tent, with speeches, flowers, and fresh air; and there was also the inevitable thunder-shower which called for the usual umbrellas, and lent the excitement of adventure to this collegico-religious picnic. The duties of the occasion commenced with the morning service at eleven o'clock. The congregation was, as is usual, too large for the chapel, and the greater part occupied seats under an awning outside, the officiating ministers being placed in one of the windows, thus commanding both portions of the crowd. The interior of the chapel was tastefully decorated with holly and red and white roses, the elegance of the reading-desks being specially noteworthy. Prayers were read by the Rev. John Sugden, B.A. The musical portions of the service were very well conducted. After a short introductory prayer, the sermon was preached by the Rev. Oswald Dykes, M.A., minister of Regent's-square Church (Presbyterian) from Isaiah lvii. 15. His discourse was an able exposition of the truth suggested by the text, that the Bible gives us two apparently irreconcileable views of God—the distant Jehovah and the ever-present Father. The one appeals to the intellect, the other to the heart. In one, He is regarded as eternal, passionless, changeless, remote, awful. In the other He is a person, manlike, kindly claiming an affinity with us and becoming even our confidant. These ideas are inconsistent. Yet both must be believed. This wondrous Being is spoken of as possessing two homes: one far off, exalted, in the light unto which none can approach; the other near, where He is as the house-father, in the heart of the contrite man. For this latter He has humbled Himself, and become of no reputation. The latter part of the sermon was taken up with the consideration of the conditions on which the High and Holy One takes up His dwelling in the hearts of men. The entire discourse was listened to with close attention, and fully deserved the high commendation with which it was referred to by several speakers in the after part of the day.

At the close of the service the congregation dispersed, some to view the new rooms of the college, others to wander amid the beauties of the garden, whilst not a few, who combined foresight with hunger, hastened to secure seats at the dinner-table. Dinner was served in a large marquee gaily decorated with flags, whilst the tables were covered not only with the "good things" which appealed to the sense of taste, but also with choice flowers, beautiful to the eye and of refreshing fragrance. The chair was occupied by the Rev. Dr. Halley, who never looked so hale or seemed in better spirits. No fault could be found with the fare, and justice was done to the feast by all. At its conclusion the usual loyal toast was given, followed by two verses of the National Anthem. The chairman's speech was one of his happiest efforts. It was scarcely credible, as that clear voice was heard ringing out with trenchant humour and many a happy turn of kindly wit, that half a century had passed away since the owner of that voice was recognised as an Independent minister in the little Huntingdonshire town. Two generations of ministers had been under him as tutor, and it seemed as if there were fire and life still remaining enough to educate two other generations. Amid all the *abandon* of the "old man eloquent" there might have been discerned the sturdy ancient Nonconformist spirit which would not brook submission even to so much fetter of subscription as is demanded still by the college of her very religious ladyship, Selina of Huntingdon; and not a few must have thought, as they watched that bright countenance and that snowy head, "There speaks a man with tongue sharp as a rapier, but with heart so kindly, that he never made an enemy, or knew even an opponent but as a friend."

Dr. Halley was followed by the celebrated American minister, Dr. Cuyler, who was received by the company with much enthusiasm. His words of warning concerning the danger of endowments are worthy of serious thought. It is quite true that the church militant must not be the church mendicant, but a living church will always find free and generous support from each age for its own necessities. His remarks on personal, plain, and practical preaching were very pertinent. His story about the negro preacher who first 'spounded a text, then 'splained it, and den put in de rousements, will doubtless be heard at many a ministerial gathering shortly to be held, until it grows into a veritable ecclesiastical Joe Miller. We trust the last point of the nigger's recipe for sermons will not be forgotten by a good many ministers whom we might name. The toast, "Cheshunt College," which was proposed by Dr. Cuyler, was responded to by Dr. Allon reading the cash statement, from which it appeared that there was a deficit on the current account of 70*l.*, while 1,650*l.* was still required to complete the building fund. The advantages possessed by Cheshunt over all other colleges were very pleasantly set forth by the rev. Doctor, but it may be a consolation to at least one of these institutions to know, that to supply the place of Mr. Todhunter, who has lately retired from the position of a tutor at Cheshunt, its committee have been glad to secure the services of Mr. Christie, a late student of New College. The meeting was then addressed by C. E. Mudie, Esq., the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, the Rev. Dr. Healy, of New Orleans, and several other ministers and gentlemen. During the course of the afternoon a testimonial from present and former students was presented to Professor Todhunter, in the name of the contributors, by the Rev. Mr. French. The skies added their quota to the gift of the day, but the benevolence of the clouds was met only by a forest of umbrellas, which converted the scene beneath the canvas into a remarkable and picturesque spectacle. Heavy showers, however, were powerless to damp enthusiasm or check after-dinner eloquence. Time alone compelled adjournment, and most of the company retired to the chapel, where the prizes were presented to the successful students by Dr. Halley, who again presided.

The report was read by the Rev. Dr. Reynolds, president of the college, when the following gentlemen were mentioned with distinction:—The college prizes were awarded to Richard Lovett, Henry Bottomby, Thomas Rogers, and William Beckett (equal), William Ackelford. Soper scholarships were awarded to Ebenezer Reeves Palmer, B.A., and Thomas Rhys Evans. Certificates of honour were given to James Menghies and Henry Johnson. The elocutionary prizes were gained by Henry E. Bottomby and W. Ackleford. The president's prize was awarded to Henry E. Bottomby. During the session the honours of the University of London had been obtained as follows:—H. E. Bottomby, in the first division at matriculation; E. P. Price, R. S. Holmes, and R. Lovett, passed the first examination for the degree of B.A.; E. R. Palmer, the second examination, taking honours in moral philosophy, and a prize in the Scripture examination.

After some words of hearty good wishes and genial counsel from the Chairman, the usual vote of thanks was presented to Dr. Halley by Professor Reynolds, and the meeting was closed by the pronouncing of the benediction. Little remained now to detain the visitors. Tea was provided in the grounds, after which the crowd rapidly dispersed, leaving Cheshunt for another year, with very pleasant recollections of the festival, in drenching rain, and for the most part not without the sense of having gone through a full and well-ordered day.

The chief event of this year is the retirement of Professor Todhunter. He has for many years occupied a most honourable and useful post, and it must have been gratifying to his feelings to be referred to by old students with so much gratitude and esteem. He leaves with the regret and best wishes of all connected with the college. Mr. Christie, his successor, is a gentleman of culture and experience in tuition. It is confidently believed that in him the Principal and Dr. Evans will find a colleague who will render service to the institution second only to their own. Cheshunt is heartily to be congratulated upon the life and vigour which it displays. Much of this is due to the effective way in which the affairs of the college are conducted by the committee and secretaries, but still more to the thorough work which appears to be done within doors. The professional staff is ably and thoroughly efficient. It will be the fault of the students if they do not come out of the institution well-furnished and prepared ministers.

The general arrangements of the day were conducted by the secretary, Mr. J. T. Beighton, whose skill and courtesy tended much to the success of the anniversary. Universal enjoyment was experienced by all who attended, and the 104th festival of Cheshunt College will be pleasantly remembered by numbers who "assisted" at it. The humdrum character of the annual meetings of most of our colleges stands in very poor contrast with the brightness and exhilaration of the Cheshunt meeting. Perhaps the fearful and wonderful results which are expected from the commission which was born of the late College Conference, may contain amongst them this one thing—the improvement and enlivening of academic anniversaries. The commission cannot do better than hold one of its sittings after the next festival, and gain some valuable suggestions as to the happy combination of picnic, prayer, and prize-giving which is so useful and popular at the Cheshunt institution.

ROTHERHAM.

The annual meeting of the friends and supporters of this college was held on Wednesday, June 26, when the address to the students was delivered in the Independent Chapel, Masbro', by the Rev. Robert Moffat, D.D. The chapel was well filled by a most respectable assemblage. After the singing of a hymn, the Rev. W. Thomas, of Leeds, read the 6th chapter of Paul's 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, and then offered prayer. The address of the venerable missionary was listened to with great interest, and at its close Dr. Falding, on behalf of the students, the committee of the college, and of the congregation, tendered his best thanks to Dr. Moffat for the address; and he thought he might venture to say that the Moffat Institute, for the preparation of Christian native men for the ministry, would receive the help of the people of Rotherham. (Applause.) The vote was carried with acclamation. Subsequently the annual meeting was held in the library, the Mayor of Rotherham (J. M. Habershon, Esq.), in the chair. The proceedings were opened with prayer, after which the minutes of the previous annual meeting, and the various meetings of committees held during the year, were read by Mr. J. W. Pye-Smith, the secretary. Dr. Falding then read the report of the committee, which stated that the session commenced in September with fourteen students, that two had since been admitted, and that three had accepted pastorates. The course of studies pursued during that period was then described, and it was stated that the Rev. C. C. Tyte, the classical tutor, had been laid aside by severe illness, from which he was now slowly recovering. The report also referred at some length to the amalgamation scheme with Airedale College, which had been delayed owing to the difficulty of finding a site near Bradford. The offer of land at Saltaire by Sir Titus Salt was still under consideration, but as yet no decision had been arrived at. Reference was also made to the recent college conference in London, and the belief expressed that, if the colleges were better known, if the churches generally took pains to ascertain what the colleges are conscientiously endeavouring to do, and what they are actually accomplishing, there would then be much less dissatisfaction and much more approving confidence.

Dr. Falding said that he had not yet received the report of the examination in Systematic Theology, conducted by the Rev. J. Lockwood, B.A. The examination of the students in Hebrew, and in patristic theology, by Dr. John Harrison, vicar of Fenwick, and formerly a student at Rotherham, was generally satisfactory. The reports of the Rev. W. Crosbie, M.A., LL.B., on examinations on Logic and Pyschology; and the Rev. F. Creak, B.A., of Leicester, on Mathematics, were also read. They spoke highly of the general efficiency of the students. The Rev. Philip

C. Barker, M.A., LL.B., read the reports of his examinations of the students in Greek and patristic theology. The Rev. James Smith, M.A., gave the result of the examination in classics.

Mr. John Askham, the vice-treasurer, made a financial statement, from which it appeared that up to the present time the income was somewhat short of that of last year, owing to the uncertainties of the amalgamation scheme. Mr. G. Olroyd moved, and the Rev. J. Boyd, of West Melton, seconded the adoption of the report, and a vote of thanks to the committee. The Rev. James Parsons, of York, moved, and the Rev. J. Bonser, B.A., of Rawmarsh, seconded, the appointment of the new committee. Thanks to the treasurer and vice-treasurers were also cordially voted, also to Dr. Moffat for his address to the students—(loud cheers)—and to the examiners. Dr. Falding alluded to the various untoward incidents, illness and the like, which had hindered their work, and said that in preparing young men for the ministry they wanted young men of education who would give all their time to the studies of those things which belong to the arduous life—he would not call it profession—upon which they would have to enter. When that time did come, he was persuaded that it would certainly be to the benefit of both churches and ministers. The Rev. D. Loxton, of Sheffield, seconded the proposition, and said that Dr. Moffat's visit and address would be a marked event in their lives. Some other resolutions were passed, and the meeting having been concluded with prayer, the friends dined together in the refectory.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

On Tuesday week the distribution of prizes in the faculties of arts, laws, and science, took place in the theatre of the college, Gower-street, Mr. Cave, M.P., presiding. Professor Croom Robertson, the dean of faculties, read the report, which presented a very favourable picture of the progress of the college. The number of students in the day and evening classes of the two faculties was 497, as against 357 last year. The prizes were then distributed by the chairman. The Joseph Hume Scholarship in Political Economy (20*l.* per annum for three years) was given to Henry Shaen Solly, of Hampstead; the Andrews Entrance Prize of 20*l.* to R. A. Germaine, of London; the Andrews prizes (45*l.* each to second year's students), to A. H. Spokes, of Reading, and F. D. Wheeler, Norwich; first year's students' prizes (30*l.*), to C. A. Russell, London, and Frederick Stock, Devonport, Jews' Commemoration Scholarship (15*l.* per annum for two years) for general proficiency, to C. A. Russell. The prizes in the various classes of the college are too numerous for mention, but exception must be made in favour of the political economy class, in which the first prize was obtained by a young lady, Miss Eliza Orme, of London. The furore which this announcement created throughout the audience was immense, the male students rising on their feet, and cheering vociferously for several minutes.

NORTHERN CONGREGATIONAL SCHOOL.

The forty-first annual meeting of friends and subscribers to the Northern Congregational School, Silcoates, was held on Thursday, being preceded as usual by the exercises of the pupils and the distribution of prizes to the successful boys, previous to breaking up for the Midsummer holidays. There was a good attendance of friends and parents of the pupils to witness the proceedings, together with a moderate sprinkling of old Silcotians. First there were a number of recitations by some of the boys, and next a debate in true Parliamentary form on the question, "Is Mr. Gladstone as well qualified to be the leader of a great party as Mr. Disraeli?" the division showing an overwhelming majority in favour of the present Premier. Dr. Bewglass having mentioned that such debates, which took place weekly, were not interfered with by the masters, and that the good-conduct prizes were voted by the boys themselves, the Rev. Dr. Simon, M.A., Principal of Spring Hill College, then distributed the various prizes, consisting of handsomely-bound books, accompanying each with appropriate remarks. The following is the

PRIZE LIST.

Good Conduct—Johnson, Calcutta; Evans, Sheffield (equal) Scripture, First—North, Stourbridge; Hirst, Huddersfield (equal). First Greek—McDonagh, London; Second Greek—Clarke, Doncaster, and Steer, Sudbury (equal). First German—McDonagh, London; Walker, Wakefield. Second German—James, Morley. First Latin—Evans, Ulverston, and North, Stourbridge (equal). Second Latin—Rowe, Leeds. Third Latin—Johnson, Calcutta. Fourth Latin—Dyson, Idle. First French — McDonagh, London; Clarke, Doncaster. Second French—Stubley, Batley; Smith, Batley; and Clifton, Blyth (equal). History—McDonagh, London. Second History—Clifton, Blyth. Third History and Third Geography—Evans, Sheffield. First Geography —Steer, Sudbury. Second Geography—Clifton, Blyth. First Grammar—Evans, Ulverston. First Writing—Evans, Ulverston. Mapping—Evans, Ulverston. Second Writing—Sutcliffe, Thirsk. Writing Improvement—Chermside, Worthing. Euclid—Evans, Ulverston. First Algebra—Evans, Ulverston. Mechanics—Evans, Ulverston. Trigonometry — Rowe, Leeds. Arithmetic, First—Rowe, Leeds. Second Algebra—Hill, Durham, and Hoyle, Pickering (equal). Third Algebra—Baines, Horbury. Reading First—McDonagh, London. First Recitation—McDonagh, London. Recitation Improvement—Rae, Batley. Debate — McDonagh, London. Spelling — James, Morley. First Drawing — Hoyle, Pickering. Second Drawing—Sutcliffe, Thirsk. Second Reading—Johnson, Calcutta. Chemistry—McDonagh, London. Second Scripture—Clifton, Blyth. Third Scripture—Evans, Sheffield. Third Arithmetic—Holdsworth, Stockton.

Dr. Simon, in addressing the boys, remarked that six-and-twenty years since he stood on the same platform, and engaged in similar recitations. He proceeded in a kindly spirit to give the pupils some good advice, after which the boys dispersed, and the business proceedings commenced, Mr. E. Hanson, of Halifax, presiding.

The report of the committee, read by Mr. Rae, in the absence of the Rev. H. Sanders, stated that promises to the amount of 2,242*l.* 2s. 6d. had been received towards the 5,000*l.* which would be required to build a new schoolroom and make such alterations as were urgently needed to provide proper domestic accommodation for the pupils, &c. The committee hoped that in a short time the 5,000*l.* would be secured, and they had resolved to begin building as soon as 4,000*l.* had been promised. The committee felt that if an earnest effort were now made, not only would the new buildings be opened free of debt, but that the school would be placed in a far higher position than it had ever yet occupied. The report of the examiners was next read. Dr. Falding, of Retherham College, prepared question papers in Latin, Greek, English and Scriptural history, geography, grammar, and arithmetic, trigonometry and mechanics—the answers being written. He reports—"The school has borne this new and severe test very satisfactorily. Some of the papers are excellent, and most of them very creditable; the failures are very few indeed. So far as I can judge, the school is most ably conducted." The Rev. Bryan Dale, of Halifax, who assisted in the examination, says that on comparing the papers at Midsummer with those of Christmas, he observes "that most of the boys have made considerable progress during the past few months. The questions put to them include those of the Oxford local examination of the present year, together with others of greater difficulty; and they have been answered in a very satisfactory manner. I send herewith an account of the number of marks attained in each case. It is with great pleasure that I bear testimony to the efficiency of the instruction given by the principal and his assistants." Mr. T. P. Robinson, one of the secretaries to the committee of Old Silcotians, presented his report, which showed that the "Old Boys" had already subscribed 550*l.* to the building fund. The following are a few of the promises which the general committee have received towards the building fund, namely:—Mr. John Crossley, 1,000*l.*; Sir Titus Salt, Bart., 100*l.*; Mr. W. H. Lee, 100*l.*; Mr. T. W. Burnley, 100*l.*; Mr. James Dodgshun, 100*l.*; Messrs. J. T. and J. Taylor, 100*l.*; Messrs. M. Oldroyd and Sons, 100*l.*: Mr. E. Hanson, 50*l.*; Mr. Remington Mills, 50*l.*; Mr. Dodgshun, 50*l.*, &c. The Chairman explained that Mr. John Crossley was unable to be present, but said he had received a letter from that gentleman saying that as he could not give personal service in respect to the new buildings, he was willing to take a somewhat larger share in the pecuniary responsibility, and would give 1,000*l.* if the work were taken up in good earnest and carried out expeditiously. (Cheers.) The Rev. J. James moved the first resolution, that the report be adopted, and that the meeting heard with pleasure that the Northern Congregational School continued to maintain its high character as an educational institution in which intellectual culture was ever accompanied by sound moral and religious training. Having had a boy at the school for some two or three years, he fully and cordially endorsed the sentiments of the resolution. Mr. J. S. Morley, B.A., Rotherham College, in seconding the resolution, expressed his pleasure at hearing that there was at last some prospect of new premises, and bore testimony, as an old Silcotian, to the sound character of the instruction given at the school, combined with moral and religious training. Other votes of thanks were moved and seconded by the Rev. C. Illingworth, Mr. Joseph Taylor of Batley, the Rev. R. Bruce of Huddersfield, Mr. Armstrong of Bradford, the Rev. I. Collier, and Mr. G. Shilling, an "old boy." Dr. Bewglass, in responding on his own behalf, referred to the system of management at Silcoates. He sought to rule by moral influence rather than by brute force. He did not think they would find another school in England where there was less of the latter used, or where there was a better lot of boys, and he was glad to know that a large number of those who had been under his care were now occupying eminent positions in society. (Hear, hear.) Amongst others were Dr. Simon, and Mr. Morley, who took his first and second B.A. at the University of London, and was now at Rotherham College. The remaining business related to the rebuilding of the school premises, the necessity of which was affirmed in a resolution moved by Mr. Matthew Wilks, of Manchester, and seconded by Mr. J. Robinson. Mr. W. H. Lee, of Wakefield, thought that 10,000*l.* instead of 5,000*l.* should be the amount of the building fund. A vote of thanks to the chairman closed the proceedings. The amount promised towards the new school now amounts to 2,900*l.*

CASH *v.* CREDIT.—Mr. Rupert Kettle, of Wolverhampton, the well-known county-court judge, in giving evidence recently before a committee of the House of Commons on the question of the Bankruptcy Laws, expressed his belief that every article of clothing he wore cost him 30 per cent. extra, owing to the system of long credit so prevalent in retail trades.

Correspondence.

NONCONFORMISTS AND THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—On May 29 a circular was issued by the officers of this committee to the secretaries of every Congregational, Baptist, and Unitarian Union and Association, and to the officers of district organisations in connection with various Methodist bodies, urging that, at their next meetings, resolutions should be submitted approving the principle of united secular and separate religious instruction. A request was at the same time made that copies of the resolution should be forwarded to the London and to the various denominational papers.

Your columns have borne witness, from week to week, to the satisfactory response which has been made to this circular. In one or two cases no expression of opinion has been elicited; *in no case has an adverse opinion been passed;* but in nearly every one the principles affirmed by the Manchester Conference have been endorsed either unanimously, or by very large majorities.

As the meetings of some associations have not yet been held, it is possible, before they are summoned, that our circular of May 29 may be overlooked. Will you allow me, therefore, to direct attention to it, and earnestly to request that its suggestions may *in every case* be acted upon? Copies of the circular, if required, may be had on application.

I am, yours truly,
F. SCHNADHORST, Secretary.

Central Nonconformist Committee, Town Hall Chambers, 86, New-street, Birmingham,
July 2, 1872.

A DAY IN THE COUNTRY.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—I beg again to ask the great favour of being allowed to appeal to your numerous readers, who so kindly assisted us last year, for funds to our intended day's excursion for the poor children of our ragged-school, and the adult portion of our mission-hall congregation in Flower and Dean-street, Spitalfields. A poorer and more destitute class cannot be found in London. We provide them both dinner and tea, and this is the only chance they have of seeing a green field or inhaling the pure air of heaven. Donations in any form may be sent to me at the office of the society.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
JAMES ATKINSON, Secretary.

Christian Community Mission Room,
56, Flemming-street, Hoxton,
London, N.

Imperial Parliament.

OCCASIONAL SERMONS BILL.

In the Commons on Wednesday, Mr. COWPER TEMPLE, in moving the second reading of this bill, said it was intended as a practical measure of administrative reform in the law of the Church of England, without touching any doctrine and without requiring the repeal of any statute or any ecclesiastical law. It was intended to give a liberty to the authorities which they certainly ought to possess, and which was not intended to be taken from them by any person who framed any direct laws on the subject. In all other Protestant communities in England there was a power exercised by the pastor to admit into his pulpit teachers belonging to other denominations, and it was a power frequently exercised with great advantage to all concerned. The same power was exercised by the ministers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and it also existed in the Episcopal Church in America. The bill did not touch the power which was inherent in a bishop to say that no preaching should take place in his diocese without his special permission. The distinction, upon which the bill rested, between discourses which were to be delivered occasionally and exceptionally, and which implied no definite relationship between the preacher and the congregation and the ordinary stated teaching of the regular ministers, was one which had been universally recognised from the earliest times of the Church. What was proposed by the bill was to place the licence of the bishop and the permission of the incumbent in regard to these occasional and exceptional sermons upon a different footing, so far as the qualification of the individual was concerned, from those discourses which were delivered as part of a stated and regular ministry. There appeared to be no distinct law requiring that the bishop in giving his licence should be so restricted as to give it to persons only who were in holy orders; and there happened to be considerable doubt as to whether at this moment the bishop could or could not exercise the discretion which was to be given to him by the bill. In consequence of that doubt the bishop would not license any persons not in holy orders, and the bill became necessary if they thought the practice

should be altered. He felt strongly that every religious community should be left as free as it could possibly be left by Parliament, and that no restrictions should be imposed for which a strong and clear necessity could not be shown. (Hear, hear.) At the time of the Restoration there was a State reason why Nonconforming ministers should not be admitted into the pulpits of the National Church. Nonconformity in religion had got closely connected with Nonconformity in State matters, and the phrase, "No bishop, no king," represented the close connection between resistance to the authority of the Church and resistance to the authority of the State. But in subsequent reigns, when religious liberty was established, the connection between resistance to the Church and resistance to the State naturally ceased, and there was consequently at this moment no political reason why they should care in the least whether a Nonconformist was admitted into the pulpit of the National Church. Was the restriction imposed upon the discretion of the bishop and the incumbent necessary for the discipline and authority of the Church? In answer to that it was sufficient to say that ministers belonging to the Episcopal Church of America and the Episcopal Church of Scotland were admitted into the pulpits of the National Church, and they were under no obligations with reference either to her doctrine or authority. He did not think that there was any national advantage in preventing by law clergymen from partaking of interchanges of ministerial offices with ministers of other bodies. Nor did he think it was any advantage to the congregations. He believed it would be advantageous to the congregations that clergymen should be permitted to admit into their pulpits persons of great oratorical powers and gifts, and that they should not be compelled always to hear subjects treated in the conventional style peculiar to the Church of England—("Oh, oh," and laughter) —he meant habitual in the Church of England. The congregations would like to hear occasionally a little variety. Many persons were of opinion that the style which prevailed in the Church of England, excellent though it might be, was yet a style which they would like to see varied occasionally. (A laugh.) He did not think the law intended to raise an artificial barrier between clergymen of the Church of England and those of other denominations, because, if so, it would have established that barrier on the one side as well as on the other. No construction put upon an Act of Parliament had made it out that it was illegal for a clergyman of the Church of England to preach a sermon in a chapel or place of worship not belonging to the Established Church. There were many cases where clergymen preached in Nonconformist chapels. The bill was not conceived in the interest of any party or school of thought in the Church, and he hoped its principle might receive the sanction of the House.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE objected to the bill as merely offering to certain individuals of oratorical tendencies the opportunity of letting off a weekly discharge of rhetorical fireworks, on a day which ought to be devoted to tranquil Christian worship. The bill would admit not only clergymen of different denominations into our national pulpits, but also mere laymen. He denied that this was the case with the Episcopal Church in America, which his right hon. friend had cited as a precedent. True, an eminent Episcopalian divine in New York had admitted a Dissenting minister into his pulpit; but in so doing he not only violated the canon of the American Episcopal Church, but went against the opinion of his bishop. His right hon. friend had gone far beyond the privileges of Wednesday legislation in the vague and incomprehensible language in which he had worded his bill. In the first clause he had made it lawful for an officiating clergyman to invite a clergyman of another denomination or a layman to preach in his church. Who was the officiating clergyman? The incumbent might have gone for his month to the sea-side, and during his absence his substitute might invite some Boanerges from the Potteries to enlighten his congregation. (Laughter.) Strangers were to be permitted to preach "occasionally." What did that mean? Was the visitor to preach one sermon, and disappear? or was his invitation to run during the lifetime of the incumbent or bishop? The bill gave no information on this point. The incumbent wrote to the bishop informing him that a gentleman from America—probably a graduate from Milwaukie seminary—(a laugh)—had arrived, and was anxious to enlighten England; and this gentleman, whose eloquence was strange and whose doctrine smelt of Geneva—(laughter)—he meant the doctrine, not the spirit—(renewed laughter)—astonished the congregation, whilst the bishop who had given him permission could not revoke it under the provisions of the bill. But worse than this, a clergyman might obtain permission for a rota of Mahomedan, Buddhist, and Comtists, and other un-Christian preachers, who in turn would enlighten English Christians in their several and peculiar doctrines. He denied that the bill offered any compliment to the Nonconformists. (Hear.) Instead of a compliment it was an insult to Dissenters, for it gave to the clerk the power of selecting the person to be invited to his pulpit, and in nine cases out of ten he would select a person of whom the majority of Dissenters disapproved. But he objected to the bill altogether as a piece of helter-skelter legislation, which was entirely unworthy the grave attention of the House, and begged to move that it be read a second time that day six months.

Mr. T. HUGHES supported the bill, reminding the House that in the early days of the Reformation it was lawful to allow Puritans to hold benefices in the Church of England. The Act 5 & 6 Victoria permitted American Episcopalian clergymen to preach in English pulpits, and members were perhaps not aware that in the American Episcopalian Church the Athanasian Creed were omitted, and that the visiting and burial services were altered. He believed that the safeguards of the bill were quite sufficient to prevent the dangers which the right hon. gentleman opposite had described, and that it was not, as he had said, a revolution in the English Church. It might admit such men as the late Norman M'Leod, or Baldwin Brown, or President Tulloch, but hardly such persons as his right hon. friend had described. The matter might, in his opinion, be safely left to the bishop who must permit the preaching, and who would be responsible for the person selected.

Mr. SCOURFIELD strenuously opposed the bill.

Mr. TALBOT said that so vague was the wording of the bill that even the Pope might be invited to preach in a Church of England pulpit. He trusted that the House would not assent to the proposition of the right hon. member for Hants.

Mr. HENRY RICHARD: After the appeal just made to us by the hon. member for West Kent, perhaps a few words from a Nonconformist member may not be out of place. I desire to do homage to the motives by which the right hon. gentleman who has introduced this measure has been actuated. I am sure he has been prompted by the purest and kindest feelings. (Hear, hear.) His object is to cultivate Christian charity and that brotherly love which is the most essential and characteristic affection of the Christian life. But, unhappily, Christian charity and brotherly love, especially for those that are without, are plants which will not flourish under the shadow of an Established Church. (Cheers.) We had an illustration of this last night, when hon. gentlemen opposite came down in great force to defeat a bill which has been repeatedly accepted by this House by large majorities, the sole object of which was to ask them to permit their fellow-Christians of other denominations than the Church of England to bury their dead in the national churchyards by their own ministers, and with the religious services most acceptable to their feelings. (Loud cheers.) One would have thought that this was not a great stretch of Christian charity and brotherly love, but it was too great for the members of an Established Church. With regard to the proposal now before us, I must confess that I feel no great interest in it one way or the other. What strikes me most in connection with it is the utterly humiliating position in which a Christian church is placed in having to come to a House constituted as this is, to ask our leave as to the regulation of its own internal and spiritual affairs. (Hear, hear.) This, of course, must be the case so long as you have the Church connected with the State; but it is none the less a humiliation. The hon. gentleman the member for West Kent, has said that this House had no power to legislate for the Church.

Mr. TALBOT: What I said was that this House was not the only body that could legislate for the Church.

Mr. RICHARD: Well, then, will the hon. gentleman tell me what is the other body that has power to legislate for the Church? (Cheers.) The truth is, that you cannot do the least thing; you cannot abridge, or alter, or modify in the smallest degree your religious services on Sundays or holidays; you cannot provide for the resignation of your bishops and deans when disabled by age or infirmity; you cannot invite ministers of other Christian denominations to occupy your pulpits without coming down here cap in hand, to ask permission to do so. There is no other religious body in the land, the smallest and humblest, who would not feel its dignity and freedom as a Christian church compromised by being obliged to submit its internal arrangements to a secular assembly like this. (Hear, hear.) You are paying heavy penalties for the questionable privilege of being patronised by the State. (Cheers.) I hope the members of the Church of England will before long determine to escape out of this worse than Egyptian bondage, to enjoy that freedom wherewith Christ intended His Church to be free. (Cheers.)

Mr. D. DALRYMPLE said he remembered once hearing the Bishop of Norwich say to Mr. Brock, an eminent Nonconformist divine, "I hope to see the day when you, Mr. Brock, will preach in Norwich Cathedral." "I hope so too, my lord, but it will not be until you come to preach in St. Mary's Chapel." (Hear, hear.) That such a consummation was desirable, few would deny, and he looked to the bill before the House as a step towards its production. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. HENLEY doubted whether such a measure as this would lead to peace and charity in the different parishes, or to the edification of the people. If the ordinary should allow a lecturer to use a church in his diocese for scientific purposes, many would think it harmless, many would think it good, but many would be shocked by such a use of the pulpit. They knew what difference of opinion existed with regard to the use of cathedrals for charitable festivals, and if such uses were introduced into the humbler churches, it would introduce heartburnings and discord into every parish. Suppose that an incumbent should invite Archbishop Manning to preach in his pulpit, and a neighbouring incumbent should give a similar invitation to Mr. Spurgeon, who could suppose that peace and charity would prevail in that district?

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said that if bishops and clergymen were capable of the folly of which it had been assumed that they might be guilty in admitting Mormons and Mahomedans to Church pulpits, the sooner we dismissed the idea of Establishment the better. As one who valued Establishment, he looked with astonishment at the recklessness of those who attempted to hold a beleaguered post by fixed bayonets. Archbishop Tillotson petitioned the King that it might be in the power of the bishops to admit Presbyterians and Nonconformists to Church pulpits; and was the name of Tillotson to be coupled with Mormons and Mahomedans? The bill had not been discussed fairly; all that they were now concerned with was its principle and spirit; and if that were approved, the faults of the bill could be amended in committee.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said that the promoters of the bill, in the name of freedom, would deprive Churchmen of the protection of the law with respect to the doctrines to which they should be compelled to listen. It would open the pulpits of the Church of England to the Pope's emissaries, who were once granted a dispensation to occupy them; and against such a possibility the laity claimed to be protected.

Mr. MACFIE said that a restriction similar to that which this bill would remove once existed in the Church of Scotland, but it had been removed, and the Church of England was now the only Protestant Church in which such a restriction existed.

Sir C. ADDERLEY pointed out the bill would enable laymen and others to preach in our churches doctrines repugnant to the Articles of Religion, and suggested to the promoters of the measure that a more straightforward course for them to pursue would be to allow the clergy themselves to preach such doctrines, instead of calling in the aid of laymen for the purpose.

Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE said he was not a believer in the power of Acts of Parliament to settle what doctrines should be preached in the pulpit. In his opinion, the security given by this bill was the best that could be obtained—viz., the responsibility of the bishop of the diocese and of the incumbents of the Church. He believed the bishops and incumbents would take no pleasure in putting into their pulpits men who would preach against their own doctrines. If at some future time they wished to allow laymen to preach, by all means let them do so. (Hear.) If the laity did not like such a proceeding, they might abstain from going to the church. ("Hear," and laughter.)

The House divided, when the numbers were:—

For the second reading	116
Against it	177
Majority	——61

The bill was consequently lost.

THE PROPERTY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

At the evening sitting of the House of Commons on Tuesday the following motion stood first on the Order Book:—

That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that, by means of a Royal Commission, full and accurate particulars may be obtained of the origin, nature, amount, and application of any property and revenues appropriated to the use of the Church of England.

Mr. MIALL, upon the Speaker taking the chair, said:—Sir, last session when, by the courtesy and forbearance of the House, I was permitted to put before it a motion in favour of the disestablishment of the Church of England,—

At this point there was an attempt to count out the House, which signally failed.

Mr. MIALL, resuming his speech, said—When I was interrupted by the attempt to count out the House I was about to refer to the advice given me by the right hon. gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government, who closed his speech in opposition to my motion by telling me that before I could expect the House of Commons to accept my proposition, I must persuade a majority of the constituencies to give their sanction to it. The right hon. gentleman, in pointing out to me the only constitutional path to my object, backed his advice by referring to a petition against the motion which the right hon. member for the University of Oxford had presented with a rather theatrical air of triumph before I rose—a petition supposed to be from a greater number of the ratepayers of Bradford than the whole borough contains. (Laughter.) This more than unanimity, as it seemed, of my own constituents in condemnation of my proposed policy, justified the right hon. gentleman, who could not have been imagined to suspect its semi-fictitious character, in recommending me to a preliminary sphere of action, and, in good faith, those with whom I have been accustomed to act, readily agreed with me in accepting that advice. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I may speak for them, I think, as confidently as for myself, that the right hon. gentleman's counsel was taken chiefly because we had all along been of the same mind with him in this respect. We never deemed it possible to anticipate public opinion on

so momentous a question. We never desired it. For myself I can aver—and in doing so I believe I do but interpret the feeling of the bulk of those who go with me—that if I could give legislative effect to the policy of disestablishment and disendowment to-morrow, I should decline the responsibility of doing so, unless I were backed by unmistakeable and sufficient evidence that I should be thereby giving expression to the deliberate and settled will of the nation. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I desire that whatever is done in Parliament in this matter, should be done as the outcome of calm, dispassionate judgment, and in full view of all those elements of the case which ought to receive their due proportion of consideration. (Cheers.) I am not only willing, I am anxious, that light from all quarters should be shed upon the subject; that nothing should be hidden with regard to it; that no information bearing upon it should be suppressed; and that whenever the people of this country come to a determination of the problem it involves, they should come to it with minds fully informed of all the facts which can serve to guide them to a wise decision. Well, sir, the information which I wish to be laid before the country, and which I hope a Royal Commission will be able to collect and to stamp with authenticity, is unquestionably requisite to a complete and statesmanlike view of the whole case. I wish it were otherwise. I wish that the conditions of the problem were such as would admit of an entire separation of the question of disestablishment from that of disendowment. (Hear, hear.) In thought, nothing is more easy. In action, nothing could be more impolitic or dangerous. An elaborately-organised institution, whose sole object is to shape the religious faith, and guide the devotions of a community like ours, cannot safely be invested with a large amount of national property, and at the same time be freed from national control in its application of it. It is one of those instances in which self-support and self-government must go hand in hand. No wisely-ordered State can countenance an *imperium in imperio*. No enlightened subject of the State can sanction the appropriation of national resources to the irresponsible use of any organisation of men which seeks to dominate over the spiritual part of man's nature, without taking care to set legal bounds to that domination. (Cheers.) I am told, sir, and indeed I know, that some hon. friends of the object I have in view, are disappointed and aggrieved that I did not ask for a Commission of Inquiry on the whole case, and that I have limited my proposition to that feature of it which is the least worthy of searching investigation. The pecuniary phase of the question in dispute, they say—and they say justly—is of all others the least important and the most sordid. In one sense that is so—for the material possessions of a church cannot be held in comparison with the spiritual results it achieves. But, sir, no commission could ascertain spiritual results except by means of a definite and recognised spiritual standard, and this is precluded by the many differences of religious faith and practice in this country. The national judgment as to these results will be governed by opinion, and opinion can best declare itself in the deliberations and determinations of this House. I confine my motion for inquiry to the property and revenues of the Church of England, not because I believe them to present the most interesting or important phase of the controversy, but because the facts respecting them can be accurately ascertained; because a knowledge of them is necessary to a fair judgment of the whole case; and because, should the country hereafter see reason to adopt the policy of disestablishment, it will need full and minute information of this kind, to enable it to carry this policy into effect. Sir, I hold myself entitled to ask for this information on the ground that the Church of England, regarded as an Establishment, is a national institution. It is largely, I may say mainly, sustained by national resources. It derives its special *status* and privileges from national authority. It is governed by the national will, constitutionally expressed. It exists for a professedly national object. All the subjects of the realm have an equal right, within certain conditions, to claim the benefit of its offices. In its connection with the State it belongs to the whole people of the State in the same way as the army, the navy, the civil services, or the two Universities. The State, therefore, represented by the Crown, has a full right to inquire into the nature, amount, and application of the property and revenues which it enjoys. More than a generation has passed since any inquiry of this nature has been made. The Royal Commission of 1832, no doubt, stated the aggregate value of Church property at that time with general correctness—but they gave as little detailed information as possible, particularly with regard to the parochial revenues of the Establishment. Since then, a vast change has taken place both in the circumstances and the sentiments of the people. Of one half of them it may be said that they receive no direct benefit from this ecclesiastical institution. A very large number of them disapprove of the political basis on which it rests. They observe the clerical officers of it practically breaking away, day by day, from the bonds of legal discipline. They have a right to demand thorough investigation into that side of the question which falls most directly within the purview of the State—namely, the material resources by which it is upheld. (Hear, hear.) Many people think it is not doing all that may be fairly expected of it. Well, it is natural to ask, and it would be useful to learn, what are the means which have been placed at its disposal. Sir, the hon. member for West Surrey has a notice on the paper for a commission to inquire into the property and revenues of the religious bodies *not* included in the Established Church. That notice looks very much as if it were meant to be a parody on mine—(a laugh)—and hence to claim only such consideration as may be due to a practical joke. (Laughter.) I hope, however, I do the hon. member no injustice in coming to the conclusion that the purpose he had in view in giving his notice must have been a serious one. I form that judgment of it, because, as a jest, it is a very sorry one. I take for granted, moreover, that the hon. member's taste is too correct to admit of his subjecting the House to anything in the shape of practical joking, and perhaps, I should add, that his notice of motion, assuming it to have been given in earnest, exhibits precisely that ignorance or avoidance of the real points at issue—(cheers)—that begging of the question in dispute, and that confusion of ideas in relation to the difference between public and private rights—which the hon. gentleman has again and again displayed in this House. But, Sir, although the hon. member for West Surrey shuts his eyes, with the strongest will imaginable, against the essential difference between endowments and other means of income held from the whole people of England and Wales, for the use of the whole people of England and Wales, and those given by private individuals to private religious communities, he cannot either annihilate or lessen that difference. What I apprehend him to mean is that the endowments and other means placed at the disposal of the Church of England, are placed at the disposal of an independent religious community, and that the State has the same right to inquire into the means of sustaining the spiritual instructions of the Independents or the Baptists, or the Methodists, as it has to investigate the pecuniary resources of the Protestant Episcopalians at present in connection with the State—a position in which I don't think he will be confirmed by any authoritative expositor of constitutional law. But, sir, I take this opportunity of assuring the hon. member that—always assuming the question of right to be held in reserve—I, for one, would willingly assist in acquiring for the State any information respecting the "ways and means" of non-established religious communities which the State may deem it necessary to collect for public purposes. Assuredly they have no reason to shrink from the fullest disclosure of the origin, nature, amount, or application of the property or revenues appropriated to their use. (Cheers.) Whether it would be consistent with general and recognised principles of public policy to ask the Crown to make this inquiry into private affairs, it will be for Parliament to judge. (Hear, hear.) As to the information for which I ask, it strikes me, sir, that even the stoutest defenders of the State-Church system should not hesitate to put the country in possession of it. They have the most unwavering confidence in the superiority of the existing over all other systems of providing for the religious instruction of the whole community. They profess—and, no doubt, in perfect sincerity—to believe in the religious attachment of a majority of all classes to the National Church. They are fully aware of, and naturally regard with disapproval, the efforts which are being made to change the relations in which the Church stands to the State. Both the parties in this controversy—perhaps the greatest in modern times—(cheers)—may well desire to enjoy the advantage of a complete and accurate knowledge of the actual facts of the case. Anything savouring of mystery or of studied concealment in a matter of this kind, is sure to stimulate imagination, to breed exaggerated and sometimes extravagant notions, and to favour a semblance of argument which might possibly disappear in this light of truth. Not only is the country *entitled* to know, but all classes of the kingdom are *interested* in knowing, all that can be known, in contradistinction from whatever can be only guessed respecting a national institution which takes charge of their highest interests. I trust this view of the motion will present itself to those hon. members who, at first glance, are opposed to it. They really can gain nothing by concealment. (Hear, hear.) They are likely only to give fictitious strength to misconceptions, to excite popular prejudice, and probably to foster false notions, which, for the sake of the Church to which they are attached, they had much better dispel. Sir, I will even venture to urge upon them a much higher consideration. It will not be denied, I apprehend, on either side of the House that the *vis vitæ*, the moral power of Christian truth—of that truth which Parliament is so intent upon having taught daily in its elementary schools—may be, and usually is, very seriously impaired by being associated with any determination of the rulers and guardians of the Church, to withdraw or to withhold from public inspection all authentic information on the subject of ecclesiastical finances. It would be a misfortune, not merely to the Church of England, but to religion, if this House, by refusing to inquire, should encourage large numbers of our working men in their suspicion that national religious organisations are chiefly held together by the vast extent of their endowments, and that these endowments, believed to be extravagant because accurate information of them is never given to the public, constitute the principal end of the State Church, rather than the necessary means to an end. Such a stumbling-block as this might be promptly and effectually removed by the work of a thoroughly honest commission, and by the publication, in an authentic form, of the information they will be able to collect. I trust, therefore, that no serious opposition will be made to the motion with which it is my intention to conclude. Now, sir, if the House will kindly give me its attention for a few minutes—for I do not mean to detain it long—I will explain, as cursorily as possible, the kinds of information which a royal commission might elicit and authenticate for the use of the public. I will speak first of the financial provision made in the parishes for the conduct of Divine worship and the spiritual instruction of parishioners—in other words, of the various kinds and sources of income which singly or in the aggregate constitute a benefice. Well, sir, I believe I am justified in saying that, in regard to these, no complete and thoroughly trustworthy account of their financial value is available to the public. True, it does not lack information on some points; but then on other items no public means of accurately ascertaining the truth exist. It is a fact, I believe, that since the report of the Commission of 1832 was published, the number of benefices has been increased by nearly four thousand; and it is also beyond question that considerable additions are being made, year by year, to the incomes of the poorer rectories and vicarages. But in regard to some of these benefices, is there access to any common source of information which gives an authoritative detailed statement of the parochial revenues? There is, to be sure, the "Clerical Directory." There is also the "Clergy List," and there are several diocesan calendars. But, unfortunately, the estimates of value given in these works in respect of each benefice frequently disagree one with another, and when compared with the schedules attached to the reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, they all exhibit discrepancies which deprive them of all value for statistical and public purposes. Well, sir, parochial benefices may be roughly ranged into two classes—those more ancient ones deriving the chief part of their annual revenue from tithes and glebe lands, and those more modern ones which, formed, as they have been, for the most part, to overtake the wants of rapidly expanding towns and populous places, have been otherwise endowed. It would largely conduce to clear views on the question of disestablishment, and still more of disendowment, that the two categories should be kept distinct. They stand respectively in a very different relation to what is equitably due to them from the State. They each belong, it is true, to the same ecclesiastical system, but it can hardly be maintained that each comes under the same conditions in reference to the question of a continuance or discontinuance of a national establishment. Now, sir, I am anxious first of all to obtain authentic information respecting the origin of the more ancient parochial endowments. Whence did they come? From what sources were

they derived?—private or public, individual or national? Take, for example, the old tithe system of rent-charge. Did that originate in private beneficence or in public law? The people of this country are being incessantly told that the State did not confer her ancient parochial endowments on the Church, and that what the State did not give, the State has no right to take away. But is it historically correct to say that the State did not, as the effect of civil authority and positive legislation, bring into existence the great bulk of the tithe property of this kingdom? I may be told that this is a purely archæological question, about which wide differences of opinion have been held by the best informed, and that no commission can authoritatively settle it. Sir, I dispute that allegation. My contention is that not only can the problem be finally solved, but, in my humble opinion, it can be best and most satisfactorily solved by the investigation of a Royal Commission. I shall be asked, *cui bono?* Well, sir, a thoroughly substantiated knowledge of the origin of our parochial rent-charges may materially influence the judgment of a vast number of persons as to their moral right to approach the consideration of the main question at all. It is not fair to them, it is not fair to the country, that they should be left under easily removable erroneous impressions by which their view of the whole controversy is greatly prejudiced. They are told over and over again with unfaltering assurance that the property of the Church rests upon precisely the same foundations as the territorial property of every landowner in the country—that to meddle with the one would be to shake the basis of the other; and that, inasmuch as it was given to the use of the Church of England by our pious forefathers out of their own possessions, any alienation of it from that use, even by the authority of Parliament, can only be effected by "confiscation and sacrilege." These, sir, are ugly words, and are freely resorted to by those who wish to scare moderate men away from fair and intelligent conclusions on the subject. Either they are true or they are untrue. If true, let them be confirmed by evidence—if untrue, let them wither beneath the light. (Cheers.) Of course, the House will not expect me to go into any discussion of this branch of the subject. Even if I could lay down the truth in regard to this matter with the most perfect exactitude, it would need the stamp of some unquestionable authority to give it general currency. Now, sir, a Royal Commission, unless, indeed, I am wholly mistaken in the views I entertain, could demonstrate by a chain of indisputable facts, that the old tithe system could not have originated in private liberality, and that, as to the bulk of this kind of property, it necessarily grew out of the operation of public law. (Hear.) It will not be disputed, I imagine, that unenclosed, uncultivated, or, as the Act 2 & 3 Edw. VI., cap. 13 has it, "barren or waste ground" paid no tithe until it was "improved and converted into arable or meadow land." Well, it was surely by the force of common law, and not by the private beneficence or piety of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, that waste land, when brought under culture, or, in other words, when redeemed from waste and barrenness, became chargeable with tithe, and it was by statute law, namely, the 2 & 3 Edw. VI. cap. 13, that the land thus taken into cultivation was exempted expressly, too, for the encouragement of agriculture, from payment of tithes during the first seven years. Well, sir, between the years 1760 and 1849, Parliament passed not fewer than 3,867 Enclosure Bills bringing under cultivation 7,350,577 acres, and purely by this process and no other adding them to the legally titheable area of the country. Now the latest agricultural statistics show that the total acreage of land under tillage or pasture in Great Britain amounted in 1871 to somewhat upwards of 26,000,000 acres. If we allot 24,000,000 of these to England and Wales, and set down the number of acres redeemed from waste during the last hundred years at 8,000,000, which is probably much within the mark, it will appear (since eight is just one-third of twenty-four), that at least a third of the tithe property of the kingdom was brought into existence within the last century. Well, sir, a Royal Commission could bring out the truth of all this in dates and figures—it could carry the process back to Edward VI.'s reign, when the whole extent of land under the plough and depastured could not have exceeded above 6,000,000 acres, or about a fourth of what it is now. Nay, it might safely run back to the time of King John, when lords of manors first ceased to appropriate their tithes wherever they pleased, and might show by incontestable facts and figures that of eight-ninths at least of the tithe property of this kingdom, since commuted into rent-charge—*i.e.*, of 21,500,000 acres out of 24,000,000, on the annual produce of which rent-charges are now held due to the Church—the tithes could not, by any possibility, have originated in private munificence, and could only have come into being at the creation of public law. But it will hardly be necessary for me to remind the House that tithe rent-charge is not by any means the only kind of ancient ecclesiastical endowment devoted to religious purposes in parishes which I have classed in the first category. Sir, I wish we had as much trustworthy information respecting glebe lands as we have in the case of tithe rent-charges. But, Sir, so far as my researches have gone, we have none whatever. It is, let me suggest in passing, a matter in which full and accurate knowledge is highly to be desired on other besides ecclesiastical grounds. The amount of landed estate held by corporations sole in a country of large population and limited area like this island, cannot justly be looked upon as a question of no importance. A knowledge of all the facts relating to it is even now of great moment in determining the expediency of the national policy in respect of the tenure of land. Yet the country is in the most helpless and hopeless ignorance respecting it. The public can ascertain from no authority that I am aware of, what is the proportion in the number of parishes in which glebe lands constitute part of the ecclesiastical endowment, nor the average value of the land held in each case, nor the annual revenue derived from it, or likely to be derived from it in the changing condition of the future, nor how much has been given by individual liberality, nor how much has been added from public ecclesiastical funds. I should be sorry even to give a guess at either a minimum or a maximum total of the revenue derived to the Established Church from this source. I should even shrink from characterising it as either relatively small or great. There are no authentic *data* on which to form an estimate. I, therefore, deem myself entitled to ask for authentic information. I turn now, sir, to the other class of parishes to which I have referred—namely, the more recently formed, the less amply endowed, and, for the most part, the densely populated parishes which do so much of the work of the Church of England in large towns. Sir, there will be no difficulty or dispute here as to the origin of the endowments, although a precise statement of their nature and amount may serve a useful purpose. My own impression is that these parishes, their financial arrangements, and the work that is being done in them, will present one of the most instructive chapters in any report of any commission on the subject of ecclesiastical finance—in one view of it most creditable to and commendatory of the Church of England as a spiritual institution. Sir, I believe they have a tale of their own to tell—a very impressive one, and one which none of her children need blush to hear—a tale which will command admiration and respect even where no allegiance is paid to her ecclesiastical or theological authority—but a tale which will not illustrate very vividly the aptitude of the State-Church system to deal fitly and promptly with the varying circumstances and wants of successive generations. However, sir, our desire is that all the facts relating to every aspect of the case should be known, whether they tell for or against our politico-ecclesiastical theories. The number of Church edifices and of parsonage houses in both the kinds of parish I have named, their origin and estimated value—the funds by means of which they are kept in repair—the working of the voluntary Church-rate system—the average annual amount of clerical fees, and, where they are obtained, of Easter dues—what amount is paid, under various Church-building Acts, in the shape of pew-rents—and what is obtained in the metropolis by rates on householders in lieu of tithes—these are topics which the commission might elucidate. Well, Sir, I promised the House that I would not detain it long—and for the sake of my own motion, for the discussion of which an evening's sitting is not likely to give more ample time than is necessary, I shall resolutely keep my word. I leave the cathedral property, that in the hands of the governors of Queen Anne's bounty, of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and in the possession of the bishops—though some of these are tempting themes—to be dealt with by others, as far as time and occasion may serve. Of course, they would all be included in the inquiry I propose. Well, now, sir, I am truly at a loss to conceive what are the real objections to the inquiry I propose. I have some ground for thinking that it is not the inquiry itself which provokes opposition so much as the circumstances under which, and the quarter from which, the motion for it proceeds. It is a first step leading up towards disestablishment, I am told. It is urged upon the adoption of the House with an ultimate view to that legislative consummation. It is a sequel to the motion of last year. It is brought forward by the same political and Parliamentary party. Sir, I am not disposed to deny that these allegations are substantially true—but I certainly fail to see in them any sufficient reason for locking up in reserve the information requisite to let the country look at the facts as they stand. Is it apprehended that if the people are allowed to inspect the financial mechanism of the Church Establishment, the modes in which it works, and the results which it achieves, they will forthwith repudiate the connection between Church and State? Of course no such consequence is thought to be likely by those who intend to resist this investigation. Nay, ought not the friends of the State-Church system to show such confidence in the wisdom, the purity, the regularity, and the economy which characterise the working of its financial arrangements, as to take pride in welcoming the closest and most scrutinising inspection, and the more so by misinformed opponents of that system? On the other hand, is it believed that a *bonâ fide* commission of inquiry will be sure to bring to the light a certain proportion of financial abuses and ecclesiastical jobbing? Why, even so, it will be better to lance unsound places than to let them fester beneath an unbroken skin. You will not weaken the Disestablishment party by refusing the inquiry I propose. You will not strengthen their immediate influence by granting it. In a great controversy like that which is seeking to settle the true relations of the State to the religious institutions of the community—a controversy, be it borne in mind, that no human will can stay, which is exciting thought and is stirring action in every country in Europe, and which, whether with or without our assent will be a matter of small importance, is everywhere advancing with irresistible momentum to its clearly foreseen issue—in such a practical controversy, I repeat, the cleverest stratagems of party go for little, and do but resemble the sand castles which children build upon the beach and see speedily engulfed by the incoming tide. We are sure, or, if we are not, we might be, that the days are not very far off which will witness the solution of this greatest problem of the age in a form, it is to be hoped, most in harmony with social, civil, and political justice on the one hand, and with the freedom and independence of organised spiritual life on the other. Sir, I will not pretend to hide from the House that I am intensely interested in looking forward to, and working for, so eminently a desirable result. It is as a contribution towards a wise and truthful, and I may add considerate, decision by the people of this country of the question at issue, and towards a fair adjustment of the numberless and complicated details it involves, that I ask for the assistance of a Royal Commission of Inquiry. There are not a few who think that I am asking for what will greatly obstruct and possibly ruin my own object. There are many more who fancy I am seeking knowledge with a view merely to destructive ends. Sir, I do but ask an increase of light, fully content to leave to the determination of the future whether, and to what extent, its effect will be favourable or unfavourable to the views I entertain, and fully convinced that the evident knowledge of facts can do no harm to what is true in itself. (Cheers.)

Mr. LEATHAM: In rising, sir, to second the motion of my hon. friend, it seems to me that it is quite premature to go at any length into the arguments by which a State-Church is defended or assailed, because the terms of my hon. friend's motion include no reference to this question. And if it be contended, that my hon. friend has not concealed his object in asking for this commission, I would reply that even if my hon. friend's motion be carried and this commission appointed, the relations between the Church and the State will remain unchanged. All that we shall have gained will be information which will be equally at the service of both the assailants and the defenders of a State Church—and surely it will argue great want of confidence in the position of the Church and the defensibility of that position if hon. members should oppose a motion which does not bind the House in the least degree, and only prays for more light. I rise, therefore, sir, less with the view of combating by anticipation speeches like those which possibly we may hear to-night from that side of the House, than of endeavouring still further to illustrate and enforce the demand of my hon. friend by a reference

so momentous a question. We never desired it. For myself I can aver—and in doing so I believe I do but interpret the feeling of the bulk of those who go with me—that if I could give legislative effect to the policy of disestablishment and disendowment to-morrow, I should decline the responsibility of doing so, unless I were backed by unmistakeable and sufficient evidence that I should be thereby giving expression to the deliberate and settled will of the nation. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I desire that whatever is done in Parliament in this matter, should be done as the outcome of calm, dispassionate judgment, and in full view of all those elements of the case which ought to receive their due proportion of consideration. (Cheers.) I am not only willing, I am anxious, that light from all quarters should be shed upon the subject; that nothing should be hidden with regard to it; that no information bearing upon it should be suppressed; and that whenever the people of this country come to a determination of the problem it involves, they should come to it with minds fully informed of all the facts which can serve to guide them to a wise decision. Well, sir, the information which I wish to be laid before the country, and which I hope a Royal Commission will be able to collect and to stamp with authenticity, is unquestionably requisite to a complete and statesmanlike view of the whole case. I wish it were otherwise. I wish that the conditions of the problem were such as would admit of an entire separation of the question of disestablishment from that of disendowment. (Hear, hear.) In thought, nothing is more easy. In action, nothing could be more impolitic or dangerous. An elaborately-organised institution, whose sole object is to shape the religious faith, and guide the devotions of a community like ours, cannot safely be invested with a large amount of national property, and at the same time be freed from national control in its application of it. It is one of those instances in which self-support and self-government must go hand in hand. No wisely-ordered State can countenance an *imperium in imperio*. No enlightened subject of the State can sanction the appropriation of national resources to the irresponsible use of any organisation of men which seeks to dominate over the spiritual part of man's nature, without taking care to set legal bounds to that domination. (Cheers.) I am told, sir, and indeed I know, that some hon. friends of the object I have in view, are disappointed and aggrieved that I did not ask for a Commission of Inquiry on the whole case, and that I have limited my proposition to that feature of it which is the least worthy of searching investigation. The pecuniary phase of the question in dispute, they say—and they say justly—is of all others the least important and the most sordid. In one sense that is so—for the material possessions of a church cannot be held in comparison with the spiritual results it achieves. But, sir, no commission could ascertain spiritual results except by means of a definite and recognised spiritual standard, and this is precluded by the many differences of religious faith and practice in this country. The national judgment as to these results will be governed by opinion, and opinion can best declare itself in the deliberations and determinations of this House. I confine my motion for inquiry to the property and revenues of the Church of England, not because I believe them to present the most interesting or important phase of the controversy, but because the facts respecting them can be accurately ascertained; because a knowledge of them is necessary to a fair judgment of the whole case; and because, should the country hereafter see reason to adopt the policy of disestablishment, it will need full and minute information of this kind, to enable it to carry this policy into effect. Sir, I hold myself entitled to ask for this information on the ground that the Church of England, regarded as an Establishment, is a national institution. It is largely, I may say mainly, sustained by national resources. It derives its special *status* and privileges from national authority. It is governed by the national will, constitutionally expressed. It exists for a professedly national object. All the subjects of the realm have an equal right, within certain conditions, to claim the benefit of its offices. In its connection with the State it belongs to the whole people of the State in the same way as the army, the navy, the civil services, or the two Universities. The State, therefore, represented by the Crown, has a full right to inquire into the nature, amount, and application of the property and revenues which it enjoys. More than a generation has passed since any inquiry of this nature has been made. The Royal Commission of 1832, no doubt, stated the aggregate value of Church property at that time with general correctness—but they gave as little detailed information as possible, particularly with regard to the parochial revenues of the Establishment. Since then, a vast change has taken place both in the circumstances and the sentiments of the people. Of one half of them it may be said that they receive no direct benefit from this ecclesiastical institution. A very large number of them disapprove of the political basis on which it rests. They observe the clerical officers of it practically breaking away, day by day, from the bonds of legal discipline. They have a right to demand thorough investigation into that side of the question which falls most directly within the purview of the State—namely, the material resources by which it is upheld. (Hear, hear.) Many people think it is not doing all that may be fairly expected of it. Well, it is natural to ask, and it would be useful to learn, what are the means which have been placed at its disposal. Sir, the hon. member for West Surrey has a notice on the paper for a commission to inquire into the property and revenues of the religious bodies *not* included in the Established Church. That notice looks very much as if it were meant to be a parody on mine—(a laugh)--and hence to claim only such consideration as may be due to a practical joke. (Laughter.) I hope, however, I do the hon. member no injustice in coming to the conclusion that the purpose he had in view in giving his notice must have been a serious one. I form that judgment of it, because, as a jest, it is a very sorry one. I take for granted, moreover, that the hon. member's taste is too correct to admit of his subjecting the House to anything in the shape of practical joking, and perhaps, I should add, that his notice of motion, assuming it to have been given in earnest, exhibits precisely that ignorance or avoidance of the real points at issue—(cheers)—that begging of the question in dispute, and that confusion of ideas in relation to the difference between public and private rights—which the hon. gentleman has again and again displayed in this House. But, Sir, although the hon. member for West Surrey shuts his eyes, with the strongest will imaginable, against the essential difference between endowments and other means of income held from the whole people of England and Wales, for the use of the whole people of England and Wales, and those given by private individuals to private religious communities, he cannot either annihilate or lessen that difference. What I apprehend him to mean is that the endowments and other means placed at the disposal of the Church of England, are placed at the disposal of an independent religious community, and that the State has the same right to inquire into the means of sustaining the spiritual instructions of the Independents or the Baptists, or the Methodists, as it has to investigate the pecuniary resources of the Protestant Episcopalians at present in connection with the State—a position in which I don't think he will be confirmed by any authoritative expositor of constitutional law. But, sir, I take this opportunity of assuring the hon. member that—always assuming the question of right to be held in reserve—I, for one, would willingly assist in acquiring for the State any information respecting the "ways and means" of non-established religious communities which the State may deem it necessary to collect for public purposes. Assuredly they have no reason to shrink from the fullest disclosure of the origin, nature, amount, or application of the property or revenues appropriated to their use. (Cheers.) Whether it would be consistent with general and recognised principles of public policy to ask the Crown to make this inquiry into private affairs, it will be for Parliament to judge. (Hear, hear.) As to the information for which I ask, it strikes me, sir, that even the stoutest defenders of the State-Church system should not hesitate to put the country in possession of it. They have the most unwavering confidence in the superiority of the existing over all other systems of providing for the religious instruction of the whole community. They profess—and, no doubt, in perfect sincerity—to believe in the religious attachment of a majority of all classes to the National Church. They are fully aware of, and naturally regard with disapproval, the efforts which are being made to change the relations in which the Church stands to the State. Both the parties in this controversy—perhaps the greatest in modern times—(cheers)—may well desire to enjoy the advantage of a complete and accurate knowledge of the actual facts of the case. Anything savouring of mystery or of studied concealment in a matter of this kind, is sure to stimulate imagination, to breed exaggerated and sometimes extravagant notions, and to favour a semblance of argument which might possibly disappear in this light of truth. Not only is the country *entitled* to know, but all classes of the kingdom are *interested* in knowing, all that can be known, in contradistinction from whatever can be only guessed respecting a national institution which takes charge of their highest interests. I trust this view of the motion will present itself to those hon. members who, at first glance, are opposed to it. They really can gain nothing by concealment. (Hear, hear.) They are likely only to give fictitious strength to misconceptions, to excite popular prejudice, and probably to foster false notions, which, for the sake of the Church to which they are attached, they had much better dispel. Sir, I will even venture to urge upon them a much higher consideration. It will not be denied, I apprehend, on either side of the House that the *vis vitæ*, the moral power of Christian truth—of that truth which Parliament is so intent upon having taught daily in its elementary schools—may be, and usually is, very seriously impaired by being associated with any determination of the rulers and guardians of the Church, to withdraw or to withhold from public inspection all authentic information on the subject of ecclesiastical finances. It would be a misfortune, not merely to the Church of England, but to religion, if this House, by refusing to inquire, should encourage large numbers of our working men in their suspicion that national religious organisations are chiefly held together by the vast extent of their endowments, and that these endowments, believed to be extravagant because accurate information of them is never given to the public, constitute the principal end of the State Church, rather than the necessary means to an end. Such a stumbling-block as this might be promptly and effectually removed by the work of a thoroughly honest commission, and by the publication, in an authentic form, of the information they will be able to collect. I trust, therefore, that no serious opposition will be made to the motion with which it is my intention to conclude. Now, sir, if the House will kindly give me its attention for a few minutes—for I do not mean to detain it long—I will explain, as cursorily as possible, the kinds of information which a royal commission might elicit and authenticate for the use of the public. I will speak first of the financial provision made in the parishes for the conduct of Divine worship and the spiritual instruction of parishioners--in other words, of the various kinds and sources of income which singly or in the aggregate constitute a benefice. Well, sir, I believe I am justified in saying that, in regard to these, no complete and thoroughly trustworthy account of their financial value is available to the public. True, it does not lack information on some points; but then on other items no public means of accurately ascertaining the truth exist. It is a fact, I believe, that since the report of the Commission of 1832 was published, the number of benefices has been increased by nearly four thousand; and it is also beyond question that considerable additions are being made, year by year, to the incomes of the poorer rectories and vicarages. But in regard to some of these benefices, is there access to any common source of information which gives an authoritative detailed statement of the parochial revenues? There is, to be sure, the "Clerical Directory." There is also the "Clergy List," and there are several diocesan calendars. But, unfortunately, the estimates of value given in these works in respect of each benefice frequently disagree one with another, and when compared with the schedules attached to the reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, they all exhibit discrepancies which deprive them of all value for statistical and public purposes. Well, sir, parochial benefices may be roughly ranged into two classes—those more ancient ones deriving the chief part of their annual revenue from tithes and glebe lands, and those more modern ones which, formed, as they have been, for the most part, to overtake the wants of rapidly expanding towns and populous places, have been otherwise endowed. It would largely conduce to clear views on the question of disestablishment, and still more of disendowment, that the two categories should be kept distinct. They stand respectively in a very different relation to what is equitably due to them from the State. They each belong, it is true, to the same ecclesiastical system, but it can hardly be maintained that each comes under the same conditions in reference to the question of a continuance or discontinuance of a national establishment. Now, sir, I am anxious first of all to obtain authentic information respecting the origin of the more ancient parochial endowments. Whence did they come? From what sources were

they derived?—private or public, individual or national? Take, for example, the old tithe system of rent-charge. Did that originate in private beneficence or in public law? The people of this country are being incessantly told that the State did not confer her ancient parochial endowments on the Church, and that what the State did not give, the State has no right to take away. But is it historically correct to say that the State did not, as the effect of civil authority and positive legislation, bring into existence the great bulk of the tithe property of this kingdom? I may be told that this is a purely archæological question, about which wide differences of opinion have been held by the best informed, and that no commission can authoritatively settle it. Sir, I dispute that allegation. My contention is that not only can the problem be finally solved, but, in my humble opinion, it can be best and most satisfactorily solved by the investigation of a Royal Commission. I shall be asked, *cui bono?* Well, sir, a thoroughly substantiated knowledge of the origin of our parochial rent-charges may materially influence the judgment of a vast number of persons as to their moral right to approach the consideration of the main question at all. It is not fair to them, it is not fair to the country, that they should be left under easily removable erroneous impressions by which their view of the whole controversy is greatly prejudiced. They are told over and over again with unfaltering assurance that the property of the Church rests upon precisely the same foundations as the territorial property of every landowner in the country—that to meddle with the one would be to shake the basis of the other; and that, inasmuch as it was given to the use of the Church of England by our pious forefathers out of their own possessions, any alienation of it from that use, even by the authority of Parliament, can only be effected by "confiscation and sacrilege." These, sir, are ugly words, and are freely resorted to by those who wish to scare moderate men away from fair and intelligent conclusions on the subject. Either they are true or they are untrue. If true, let them be confirmed by evidence—if untrue, let them wither beneath the light. (Cheers.) Of course, the House will not expect me to go into any discussion of this branch of the subject. Even if I could lay down the truth in regard to this matter with the most perfect exactitude, it would need the stamp of some unquestionable authority to give it general currency. Now, sir, a Royal Commission, unless, indeed, I am wholly mistaken in the views I entertain, could demonstrate by a chain of indisputable facts, that the old tithe system could not have originated in private liberality, and that, as to the bulk of this kind of property, it necessarily grew out of the operation of public law. (Hear.) It will not be disputed, I imagine, that unenclosed, uncultivated, or, as the Act 2 & 3 Edw. VI., cap. 13 has it, "barren or waste ground" paid no tithe until it was "improved and converted into arable or meadow land." Well, it was surely by the force of common law, and not by the private beneficence or piety of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, that waste land, when brought under culture, or, in other words, when redeemed from waste and barrenness, became chargeable with tithe, and it was by statute law, namely, the 2 & 3 Edw. VI. cap. 13, that the land thus taken into cultivation was exempted expressly, too, for the encouragement of agriculture, from payment of tithes during the first seven years. Well, sir, between the years 1760 and 1849, Parliament passed not fewer than 3,867 Enclosure Bills bringing under cultivation 7,350,577 acres, and purely by this process and no other adding them to the legally titheable area of the country. Now the latest agricultural statistics show that the total acreage of land under tillage or pasture in Great Britain amounted in 1871 to somewhat upwards of 26,000,000 acres. If we allot 24,000,000 of these to England and Wales, and set down the number of acres redeemed from waste during the last hundred years at 8,000,000, which is probably much within the mark, it will appear (since eight is just one-third of twenty-four), that at least a third of the tithe property of the kingdom was brought into existence within the last century. Well, sir, a Royal Commission could bring out the truth of all this in dates and figures—it could carry the process back to Edward VI.'s reign, when the whole extent of land under the plough and depastured could not have exceeded above 6,000,000 acres, or about a fourth of what it is now. Nay, it might safely run back to the time of King John, when lords of manors first ceased to appropriate their tithes wherever they pleased, and might show by incontestable facts and figures that of eight-ninths at least of the tithe property of this kingdom, since commuted into rent-charge—*i.e.*, of 21,500,000 acres out of 24,000,000, on the annual produce of which rent-charges are now held due to the Church—the tithes could not, by any possibility, have originated in private munificence, and could only have come into being at the creation of public law. But it will hardly be necessary for me to remind the House that tithe rent-charge is not by any means the only kind of ancient ecclesiastical endowment devoted to religious purposes in parishes which I have classed in the first category. Sir, I wish we had as much trustworthy information respecting glebe lands as we have in the case of tithe rent-charges. But, Sir, so far as my researches have gone, we have none whatever. It is, let me suggest in passing, a matter in which full and accurate knowledge is highly to be desired on other besides ecclesiastical grounds. The amount of landed estate held by corporations sole in a country of large population and limited area like this island, cannot justly be looked upon as a question of no importance. A knowledge of all the facts relating to it is even now of great moment in determining the expediency of the national policy in respect of the tenure of land. Yet the country is in the most helpless and hopeless ignorance respecting it. The public can ascertain from no authority that I am aware of, what is the proportion in the number of parishes in which glebe lands constitute part of the ecclesiastical endowment, nor the average value of the land held in each case, nor the annual revenue derived from it, or likely to be derived from it in the changing condition of the future, nor how much has been given by individual liberality, nor how much has been added from public ecclesiastical funds. I should be sorry even to give a guess at either a minimum or a maximum total of the revenue derived to the Established Church from this source. I should even shrink from characterising it as either relatively small or great. There are no authentic *data* on which to form an estimate. I, therefore, deem myself entitled to ask for authentic information. I turn now, sir, to the other class of parishes to which I have referred—namely, the more recently formed, the less amply endowed, and, for the most part, the densely populated parishes which do so much of the work of the Church of England in large towns. Sir, there will be no difficulty or dispute here as to the origin of the endowments, although a precise statement of their nature and amount may serve a useful purpose. My own impression is that these parishes, their financial arrangements, and the work that is being done in them, will present one of the most instructive chapters in any report of any commission on the subject of ecclesiastical finance—in one view of it most creditable to and commendatory of the Church of England as a spiritual institution. Sir, I believe they have a tale of their own to tell—a very impressive one, and one which none of her children need blush to hear—a tale which will command admiration and respect even where no allegiance is paid to her ecclesiastical or theological authority—but a tale which will not illustrate very vividly the aptitude of the State-Church system to deal fitly and promptly with the varying circumstances and wants of successive generations. However, sir, our desire is that all the facts relating to every aspect of the case should be known, whether they tell for or against our politico-ecclesiastical theories. The number of Church edifices and of parsonage houses in both the kinds of parish I have named, their origin and estimated value—the funds by means of which they are kept in repair—the working of the voluntary Church-rate system—the average annual amount of clerical fees, and, where they are obtained, of Easter dues—what amount is paid, under various Church-building Acts, in the shape of pew-rents—and what is obtained in the metropolis by rates on householders in lieu of tithes—these are topics which the commission might elucidate. Well, Sir, I promised the House that I would not detain it long—and for the sake of my own motion, for the discussion of which an evening's sitting is not likely to give more ample time than is necessary, I shall resolutely keep my word. I leave the cathedral property, that in the hands of the governors of Queen Anne's bounty, of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and in the possession of the bishops—though some of these are tempting themes—to be dealt with by others, as far as time and occasion may serve. Of course, they would all be included in the inquiry I propose. Well, now, sir, I am truly at a loss to conceive what are the real objections to the inquiry I propose. I have some ground for thinking that it is not the inquiry itself which provokes opposition so much as the circumstances under which, and the quarter from which, the motion for it proceeds. It is a first step leading up towards disestablishment, I am told. It is urged upon the adoption of the House with an ultimate view to that legislative consummation. It is a sequel to the motion of last year. It is brought forward by the same political and Parliamentary party. Sir, I am not disposed to deny that these allegations are substantially true—but I certainly fail to see in them any sufficient reason for locking up in reserve the information requisite to let the country look at the facts as they stand. Is it apprehended that if the people are allowed to inspect the financial mechanism of the Church Establishment, the modes in which it works, and the results which it achieves, they will forthwith repudiate the connection between Church and State? Of course no such consequence is thought to be likely by those who intend to resist this investigation. Nay, ought not the friends of the State-Church system to show such confidence in the wisdom, the purity, the regularity, and the economy which characterise the working of its financial arrangements, as to take pride in welcoming the closest and most scrutinising inspection, and the more so by misinformed opponents of that system? On the other hand, is it believed that a *bonâ fide* commission of inquiry will be sure to bring to the light a certain proportion of financial abuses and ecclesiastical jobbing? Why, even so, it will be better to lance unsound places than to let them fester beneath an unbroken skin. You will not weaken the Disestablishment party by refusing the inquiry I propose. You will not strengthen their immediate influence by granting it. In a great controversy like that which is seeking to settle the true relations of the State to the religious institutions of the community—a controversy, be it borne in mind, that no human will can stay, which is exciting thought and is stirring action in every country in Europe, and which, whether with or without our assent will be a matter of small importance, is everywhere advancing with irresistible momentum to its clearly foreseen issue—in such a practical controversy, I repeat, the cleverest stratagems of party go for little, and do but resemble the sand castles which children build upon the beach and see speedily engulfed by the incoming tide. We are sure, or, if we are not, we might be, that the days are not very far off which will witness the solution of this greatest problem of the age in a form, it is to be hoped, most in harmony with social, civil, and political justice on the one hand, and with the freedom and independence of organised spiritual life on the other. Sir, I will not pretend to hide from the House that I am intensely interested in looking forward to, and working for, so eminently a desirable result. It is as a contribution towards a wise and truthful, and I may add considerate, decision by the people of this country of the question at issue, and towards a fair adjustment of the numberless and complicated details it involves, that I ask for the assistance of a Royal Commission of Inquiry. There are not a few who think that I am asking for what will greatly obstruct and possibly ruin my own object. There are many more who fancy I am seeking knowledge with a view merely to destructive ends. Sir, I do but ask an increase of light, fully content to leave to the determination of the future whether, and to what extent, its effect will be favourable or unfavourable to the views I entertain, and fully convinced that the evident knowledge of facts can do no harm to what is true in itself. (Cheers.)

Mr. LEATHAM: In rising, sir, to second the motion of my hon. friend, it seems to me that it is quite premature to go at any length into the arguments by which a State-Church is defended or assailed, because the terms of my hon. friend's motion include no reference to this question. And if it be contended, that my hon. friend has not concealed his object in asking for this commission, I would reply that even if my hon. friend's motion be carried and this commission appointed, the relations between the Church and the State will remain unchanged. All that we shall have gained will be information which will be equally at the service of both the assailants and the defenders of a State Church—and surely it will argue great want of confidence in the position of the Church and the defensibility of that position if hon. members should oppose a motion which does not bind the House in the least degree, and only prays for more light. I rise, therefore, sir, less with the view of combating by anticipation speeches like those which possibly we may hear to-night from that side of the House, than of endeavouring still further to illustrate and enforce the demand of my hon. friend by a reference

to the nature, amount, and application of a certain description of Church property to which my hon. friend has scarcely referred, but the barest mention of which is calculated to suggest good *prima facie* grounds for this inquiry. I mean, sir, what is called cathedral property. Now, ever since the Reformation, the management of capitular estates has been more or less scandalously wasteful, the exercise of cathedral patronage more or less impure, and the amount of work done in return for immense disbursements more or less absurdly inadequate. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, it is no part of my intention to dwell upon the abuses and scandals of the past. I shall have quite enough to do during the course of the few remarks to which I may reasonably hope that the House will extend its indulgence, in sketching those of the present. But, sir, it is a lamentable fact that in spite of all our cry for cathedral reform, in spite of Acts of Parliament innumerable, in spite of commissions sitting for two years and a half at a time, what is called the cathedral question is as urgent and as ugly as ever it was. And in making this remark, I wish myself clearly to be understood not to say that the abuses and scandals are in themselves as flagrant as once they were; but that viewed in relation to a higher tone of public morality, a deeper sense of the claims of religion upon presumably religious corporation, and a sterner condemnation of ecclesiastical nepotism, idleness, and avarice, the present aspect of our cathedral system is as full of humiliation for the Church as in those days when every vice which flourished under it was veiled and obscured by a denser if not fouler atmosphere of public opinion. (Hear, hear.) Now, before I go further, let me remind the House what the value of this property really is. The last published returns to which I have had access of the revenue of capitular corporations, are contained in the report and appendix of the Cathedral Commission. They amounted in 1852 to upwards of 300,000*l.* a year, and the fee simple of this property is valued at 16,000,000*l.* sterling. A considerable portion of these revenues is derived from what are called the appropriate rectories. The annual value of the appropriations of 23 chapters in 1852 was 266,000*l.*; the value of the vicarages and perpetual curacies was 130,000*l.*, so that the final appropriations of the chapters amounted to 136,000*l.* The result of this system in many cases is to produce great hardship to the working clergy. Thus the tithes of Caddington amount to 1,036*l.*, and the value of the living to 233*l.*; the tithes of Willesden to 1,281*l.*, and the endowment of the living to 168*l.*, while the tithes of Kingsbury are 681*l.*, and the living is endowed with only 89*l.* But to return to the gross income of the chapters, which, in 1852, amounted to more than 300,000*l.* More than half of it—viz., 160,000*l.*—went in a lump as stipends to deans and canons, 40,000*l.* more to other officers and members, and for pensions. And bear in mind that, in addition to their stipends, deans and canons are in possession of some of the richest preferments of the Church. The chapter patronage in 1852 amounted to 160,000*l.* per annum, and when the Cathedral Commission put this query to the chapters—"What is the practice of the chapters with respect to the nomination or appointment to benefices in the patronage of the chapters?"—in the vast majority of instances the reply was, "Members recommend and appoint in fixed rotation either to themselves or their nominees." (Hear, hear.) Now, what do we get in return for all these disbursements? What does the dean do for his 1,000*l.* to 3,000*l.* a year? and what do the canons do for their 500*l.* to 1,000*l.*, amply supplemented by other preferments? I will not take external evidence. It shall be all drawn from the bosom of the Church, indeed, from the bosom of the chapters. What does Dean Alford say? Speaking of the office of dean, in his reply to the circular of the archbishops, to which I shall presently refer, he says, "That office is in many of our cathedrals practically useless. The dean, while nominally the head of the cathedral body, is almost without employment. His power even to preach above his statutable three or more times in the year is called in question." "The time," said the Bishop of St. David's, when examined before the commission, "seems to me not far distant when it will be difficult to discover any function proper to a dean which might not be as conveniently exercised by a bishop residing close to a cathedral." And when the then Bishop of Carlisle was asked what objection there was to throwing the duties of the deans upon the bishops, all the reply which he could make was, "If the office of bishop and dean could be united it would be a confession that one of them was unnecessary." ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) Now for the canons. The usual number of canons attached to a cathedral is four—four men to do the work of one. Suppose any hon. gentleman was to arrange for the management of his estate on this principle, and was to appoint four stewards, each to reside on the estate for three months out of the twelve. (Hear, hear.) The whole system is preposterous and indefensible. Why, the hon. member for the University of Cambridge, in a speech at the Church Congress at Liverpool in 1869, speaks of the canons as "canons with no definite duties." And in a speech immediately preceding that of the hon. gentleman, Canon Trevor, of York, thus described the canon residentiary:—"This poor canon in residence has lately been described by an eminent dignitary of the Church as a man who receives a thousand a year for doing nothing but eating white soup. Now, in the first place, there are very few canons in England who get a thousand a year, and in the next place, I take it upon myself to say that a great deal more than white soup is eaten by all the canons in England. It is possible, indeed," he goes on to say, "that the archdeacon was speaking figuratively, and meant to describe the quality of the spiritual food which canons in residence imbibe or distribute to the people around them, and, if that is the case, I am afraid I cannot correct him, because, as far as my impression goes, canons in residence have no spiritual duties at all. In the cathedral of York there was one sermon in the year to be preached by the four residentiaries among them, but Her Majesty, with a gracious and singular consideration for the burthens of the clergy, has abolished the anniversary on which that sermon was preached, and that duty no longer exists." ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) But, sir, I may be told that, although the canons have no spiritual duties and the dean is a sinecurist, yet, that these offices are useful, however expensive, because they afford a calm and dignified retreat for men actively engaged in theological studies, and preparing works beneficial to the Church and to the world. Again I go to a dean for the reply. "Take a circuit," replies Dean Close, "through the whole canonical bodies, and how many canons will you find thus occupied? or where can you find one whose patron selected him for such a purpose? No, the truth must be told: as long as canonries are practically sinecures, tenable with the richest rectories and other preferments, the temptation is, and will be, too strong for the virtue of patrons, who will prefer kindred and friends and interest to all the claims of men of learning, whether old or young." Talk of learning, science, scholarship, contemplation, and a hundred other imaginary qualifications for deaneries and canonries. The one only qualification in past times has been a name, and that the name of the bishop of the diocese." (Cheers and laughter.) But we were paying deans and canons 160,000*l.* a year in order that we might present a working model always going of what public worship ought to be—which is open to inspection at all times so that our parish churches may form their services upon it. "You have," said the hon. gentleman the member for the University—"you have the stated, ever-recurring worship of Almighty God unstimulated by any extraordinary spasmodic incident." But Dr. Sebastian Wesley, of Winchester Cathedral, an eminent composer and organist, in the evidence which he gave before the committee, stated that "he had often heard cathedral service so performed as to suggest the idea that it were better to abolish music than to continue the abuse of so beautiful an art on occasion of any direct appeal to the Deity." But we are told that the cathedral is the musical school of the diocese. "In fact, I think," he goes on to say, "of music in all its importance at cathedrals being essentially under the guidance of capitular bodies is enough to account for the deficiency for which the cathedral service is remarkable." And I maintain that the working model of Divine worship is not attractive—and that you cannot get the public to inspect it. When my right hon. friend the member for Liskeard brought forward his motion on cathedrals many years ago, he took the pains to ascertain the average attendance at morning and evening service on week-days in our cathedrals. He found that at Durham the congregation numbered 18, and the officials 33; at Peterborough 7, and the officials 12; at Lincoln 8, and the officials 24, and so forth. Nor have we any reason to suppose that things are much better now, when the Dean of Manchester in his reply to the archbishops seems to think it matter for encouragement and congratulation that out of a population of half a million you have achieved the marvellous feat of collecting some fifteen or twenty persons at morning and evening prayer to attend "the stated ever-recurring worship of Almighty God, stimulated by any extraordinary spasmodic effort." But, having failed to draw the people, you tell us now that these services are held less for the "edification of man" than for "the glory of God." Is God glorified by a beggarly array of empty benches? (Cheers.) And, if this be the spectacle in our huge cities, what must it be where the cathedral is situated either in a wilderness, like St. David's, or in a paltry little town like Ely or Lichfield, with the population of a second-rate Yorkshire village? "Unfortunately," says the Dean of Ely, "population is locomotive and cathedrals are not. If I could, by the help of the Great Eastern steamship or Great Eastern Railway, set down Ely Cathedral in the midst of Liverpool, no doubt I could answer certain questions concerning the usefulness of that noble building in a more complete manner than I can now, but," he adds pathetically, "cathedrals will not march." Quite right, Mr. Dean, "cathedrals will not march." They never have marched, and march they never will, to the end of the chapter. If any hon. member doubts that, let him peruse a correspondence lately presented to the House—"Copy of Suggestions drawn up by Cathedral Bodies for the improvement of Cathedral Establishments." Alarmed, no doubt, by the cry for cathedral reform, and the fact that, although the Cathedral Commission, after sitting two years and a half, reported—now nineteen years ago—and not a single one of the suggestions which they made has been adopted. The archbishops addressed a circular letter to the deans, asking for suggestions of any change which they might consider important. And what were the replies? Half the deans appear to have returned no reply whatever, or, at all events, these replies were deemed wholly unfit for publication, for they find no place in this return. But let us look to the replies which were vouchsafed. Canterbury recommends the abolition of the present capitular system. Whereupon the canons, in a great fright, feel bound to inform the archbishop that the dean's views "are not to be regarded as the views of the deans' brethren." Then comes the Dean of Carlisle, recommending that the number of canons should be reduced, and the Dean of Chester, explaining why he thinks "some decisive handling of the subject by authority is urgently required." Then we come to the Dean of Durham, who says quite cheerfully, "We have held our chapter, and in direct reply to your grace's inquiries, I beg leave to say that I cannot suggest any change I consider as of great importance to the cathedral over which I preside; and that all my brethren of the chapter, except one whom I have not been able to consult, regard the subject in the same light." I have no doubt they do. In 1852 the revenues of the chapter were 57,800*l.*, and in 1857 they had increased to 81,000*l.* The dean receives 3,000*l.*, and the canons 1,000*l.* a piece. Durham exhibits a fine illustration of a Cathedral Establishment full-blown. In 1852 it consisted of the dean, 9 canons, 1 sub-dean, 6 minor canons, 10 singing-men, 2 masters of the choristers, 10 choristers, 5 supernumeraries, 4 teachers of boys in the grammar-school, 18 scholars in the same school, 8 pew-men (not canons), 30 poor women called Church widows, 2 vergers, 8 bell-ringers, 8 sub-vergers, 1 porter, 1 cook, a receiver, a deputy-receiver, a treasurer, a deputy-treasurer, a presenter, a sacrist, an organist, a librarian, a clerk of the works, a bailiff, a land-agent, a calling agent, an agent for special estates, a constable, a gardener, a woodman, in all 149. (Laughter and cheers.) Durham is perfectly contented, and has no change to suggest to the archbishops. Then comes Gloucester. Gloucester is bold; he says, "No injury would result to the Church or city if three out of the four canons were suspended." I pass on to Ely, Sir, Ely says that he "should exceedingly deprecate any further cutting down of our cathedral establishments." Now, Ely consists of two parishes, one of 2,000 and the other of 4,000 inhabitants. Ely, we may remember, "does not march," and the revenues of Ely are 16,214*l.* Those of Exeter are 11,431, and Exeter is for no change. Llandaff informs us, "There is no record of any residence having been kept by the canons until 1857, and there had been for the last 100 years and more no organ in the cathedral, and no attempt at choral services, while half the building has been for more than a century in utter ruin." Manchester is all for *more* canons. When we get to Norwich we are confronted by an extract from "Il Penseroso," and a homily on the value of monastic institutions, a recommendation to leave things pretty much as they are, and that every dean and canon should emit once in five years some contribution to theological literature—I pity theological literature. (Laughter. St. Asaph advises a reduction in the number of canons. Peterborough and St. Paul's deprecate earnestly any such thing. York recommends permanent residence; and at Rochester the dean is too old to recommend anything. (Laughter.) Now, I will ask any candid Churchman in the House whether he hopes anything from this correspondence—or whether it is not manifest that the cathedrals will not march? In fact, the Rev. Mr. Ryle says, representing as he does one of that bundle of sects which collectively we call the Church of England. "Cathedral establishments are like a ship which has run aground at high water in a spring-tide. The tide has left her. She will never afloat again. Their theory has clean broken down; the public has lost faith in them. The facts of their centuries of working are dead against them. Their occupation is gone. They are past mending and patching up." But they swallow up the proceeds of a huge mass of public property, and if I had not addressed the House at such length, I should have liked to have said a few words with reference to the incredible avarice of these corporations. (Hear, hear.) Through their system of fines and leasing, it is calculated that they have sacrificed three-fourths of the value of the estates under their charge. Now, sir, we maintain that all this calls aloud for inquiry. You have enormous revenues—and revenues which but for the avarice of those who have enjoyed them would have been more enormous, still diverted from the purposes for which they were intended into the pockets of sinecurists and pluralists. You have no adequate return whatever for these immense disbursements. "I will defy anyone to put his finger on any one of our cathedrals since the time of St. Augustine that has contributed largely to evangelisation." These are not my words, but Lord Harrowby's. "What is the use of a cathedral?" says the Bishop of Peterborough. "Principally to cultivate canons and to grow vergers." (Laughter.) Now all this property, as the present Attorney-General says, "has been given and taken subject to State control, on State terms, upon conditions laid down from time to time by the State, and liable to be altered by the power which has laid it down." All this property—every penny of it—we claim as national property. It was all acquired by the Church as a national institution. The Church was then, and is now, "the nation ecclesiastically considered." "I know no difference," said Lord Eldon, "as to the persons of whom they are composed between the Church and the State. The Church is the State and the State is the Church." The State, therefore, has a perfect right to inquire

into the application of them, and all other revenues of the Church, and if need be resume them. My hon. friend has a perfect right to initiate, if he can, that inquiry. He has stated the grounds upon which he desires to do so. In dealing with one branch alone of this question, I have endeavoured still further to strengthen his *primâ facie* case. The evidence which I have adduced has been brought from Church sources alone. Not a word have I quoted from the lips of those enemies of all that is good, the political Dissenters. (Laughter.) But it is as a political Dissenter that I speak. (Hear, hear.) I am not ashamed of the title. I would give little for the politics of the man whose religion was not at the bottom of them. (Cheers.) I think I should be ashamed if I belonged to a religious community in which scandals like those to which I have referred were permitted quietly to continue. (Hear, hear.) I think I should be still more ashamed of belonging to that religious community, and with these scandals before my eyes, should resist this inquiry on the ground that it would prove damaging and dangerous to my Church. (Hear, hear.) Sir, if the Church of England is to retain her position of supremacy, she must be prepared to meet fearlesaly and cheerfully all such inquiries as this. (Cheers.) I will go a step further and say, if in a country in which all men are presumed to be equal before the law, one form of religious belief and one system of Church Government are to be exalted in perpetuity at the expense and to the disparagement of all the rest, the Church must be prepared to prove that these scandals are but accidents—accidents to be deplored, but still accidents—and not as we contend the necessary offspring of that embrace of the Church by the State; the disastrous character of which it will be our object and our duty hereafter to expose. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. HUGHES did not offer the amendment of which he had given notice as an answer to the hon. member for Bradford, because he believed inquiry would result in good rather than evil to the Church. He therefore asked the House to recommend inquiry, adding only that the commissioners should proceed with a view to reform, and not to disestablishment. He commended the tone of the speech of the hon. member for Bradford, but the speech of his seconder amounted simply to abuse of the Church. ("No, no," and cheers.) As far as episcopal and cathedral establishments were concerned, the information asked for by the hon. member was at his disposal. ("No, no.") Then the hon. member had never studied the reports, in which he could obtain all he asked for. No doubt the real question at issue was disestablishment. The ground for entire severance rested on the theory that the sole duty of the State was the preservation of body and goods, a theory that would not hold water. The State should seek to build up a wise and an understanding nation, but how could this be done if it concerned itself with nothing but body and goods? Was it for the good of the nation that the ordinances and ministrations of religion should be brought home to every citizen? Even the hon. member for Bradford would admit that it was, yet had voluntaryism done that, or could it do it? ("Yes.") If voluntaryism was so much better than a State Church for that purpose, how did it happen that for thirty years voluntaryism had been going backwards and the Church going forwards? (Hear, hear.) What were the facts? According to the returns of the Census Commission, it was shown that, of the 5,810 chapels which had been licensed to various denominations in this country between the years 1841 and 1850, in 1851 1,413 had actually disappeared. A subsequent return showed that between 1851, and May, 1870, 2,401 more licensed chapels had disappeared. Looking to those facts, then, was voluntaryism a system which could supply the ministrations of religion to every citizen? In the "Baptist Year Book" for 1872, he found it stated that one-fourth of the existing chapels were without ministers, while in another fourth the services, which were held only on Sundays, were conducted by persons who on other days were engaged in business. On the showing of the community itself, in one-half the existing Baptist chapels there were not the ordinary and proper ministrations of religion. (Hear, hear.) The reason for this neglect was that voluntaryism must follow the purse, and could not do work in the four quarters of great cities—(Hear, hear)—as was admitted by Mr. Spurgeon in 1861, when he said it was of no use to try to establish chapels in certain places, because they were poor. But if voluntaryism could not provide the ministrations of religion in the poorest quarters, he asked whether the Church did not do that? (Hear, hear.) He not only maintained that it did, but he also asserted that there was no agency which could do so except a body which was in some way connected with the State. If this connection with the State were a great disadvantage, why had not the sects overtaken the Church? If, on the other hand, it were an advantage, why should they remove that which must be admitted to be good for this country? It was said that those who supported this resolution desired to bring about equality and freedom; but the latter they already had, and the former they could obtain for all purposes except the wretched one of precedence. The real difference between the Established Church and the Nonconformists was that the sects must necessarily be narrow, while the Church must be broad. (Hear, hear.) This was shown by comments which were made at the recent Baptist general meeting respecting the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of Mr. Bennett, when it was said "they dare not suffer themselves to be comprehended in a Church which saps the spiritual life by receiving maintenance from the State." He, however, could not imagine how it could be more sapped by that than by receiving maintenance, as most voluntary bodies did, from John Smith, the great grocer, or any other person of that kind. (Hear, hear.) It was also stated that "the judgment proves the Church to be Romanist as well as Rationalist." (Cheers from below the gangway on the Ministerial side.) According to the views of those who supported the hon. member for Bradford, it was desirable that a religious body should have some particular Shibboleth, and that a man should have to exercise an act of volition to get into that body; but what most commended the Church of England to him was that an Englishman had to exercise an act of volition to get out of it. (Hear, hear.) He put it to hon. members whether, if he did not belong to the Church of England, there was any religious body in this country that would admit him as one of its members? ("Hear," and laughter.) That the Church was as comprehensive as had been alleged was an argument in its favour, and while his hon. friends apparently liked to be connected with small separate sects, he deemed it a greater advantage and glory to belong to a body admitting men of many theological opinions. He liked a wood with various kinds of trees nourished by the same soil, air, and sun, all having an equal right to be included in it, while they preferred the elms, oaks, and firs planted out in separate places. He doubted whether they had considered the consequences of freeing so powerful a body as the Church of England from State control. According to the last report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the capitular and episcopal estates with which they dealt were of the value of 1,255,000*l.*, out of which 300,000*l.* was to be applied this year to the augmentation of poor livings, to meet an equal sum subscribed by the members of the Church for that purpose, similar sums having been so applied in previous years. The other revenues of the Church amounted to 10,000,000*l.* per annum. A body with such power and resources would as an independent corporation be too powerful, and we had seen in other countries the difficulty of making the action of such bodies compatible with good government. The hon. member might think, indeed, that those resources would be greatly reduced by taking away the glebe, tithes, and other property which belonged to the Church before the Toleration Act, the date to which he understood him to limit disendowment, but he believed that this deduction would scarcely amount to 2,000,000*l.* a-year. This question was now agitating all the nations of Europe, and he believed that if in Germany, Italy, or Spain there existed a body like the Church of England, able, with proper reforms, to meet all the spiritual destitution of the country, and yet so completely under the control of the State, such a solution would be eagerly accepted as an escape from the evils now threatening them. Despairing of their finding anything like so good a solution, he asked the House to accede to the proposed inquiry, but to do so as a step, not to disestablishment, but to reform. While the Ecclesiastical Commissioners gave full details as to episcopal and capitular revenues, it was impossible to get similar information as to parochial estates and other property. He believed there were very many cases in which there was work and no pay, more than 2,000 in which there was pay and no work, and 1,200 or 1,400 in which there was neither pay nor work. Some such inquiry was, therefore, necessary, in order to clear up anomalies as to patronage and show what reforms were required. The hon. and learned gentleman concluded by moving the omission of the words "the use of the Church of England," in order to substitute the following—"any ecclesiastical purposes; and that such commission may be instructed to consider what rearrangements in the system of parochial benefices may be needed for the better adjustment of parishes and incomes in the Church of England, and what amendments may be made in the laws relating to the patronage of benefices."

Mr. WELBY, rising to second the amendment, remarked that the original motion, though now cautiously worded, stood for many weeks on the paper with the words "disestablishment and disendowment" at the end of it, and that the fact of its being no longer a straightforward and honest resolution was an additional reason for rejecting it. He disclaimed any intention of carrying the war into the enemy's camp, or of depriving other denominations of a shilling of their endowments. He should not second the amendment if it had any such object. His sole desire was to improve and strengthen the Church of England, and let others compete with her as best they could. He hoped that assurance, in connection with the speech of his hon. and learned friend the member for Frome, would be a sufficient guarantee to the House that it was with that object and intention only that he now sought to discover the means by which some of the anomalies and abuses admitted to exist in connection with the temporalities of the Church of England might be corrected, and some closer approximation made in the pay of the clergy to the work they had to do and the social position they had to maintain. There were two reforms to which he would specially point—first, the rearrangement of the parochial system; and, secondly, the amendment of the law of patronage. He admitted the great difficulty of dealing with the second of these points, particularly with livings [illegible] private gift. But no good friend of the [illegible] would deny that, with full regard to the rights of property, some reform in regard to them was desirable. Few clergymen, he thought, were really overpaid. He had no wish to separate the clergy from their present connection with the land, or to place them in the position of State annuitants. He considered any process of general equalisation of livings both inexpedient and impracticable; but if they could put aside for a time all considerations of private interest great benefit might be effected by a little very simple rearrangement. He thought the Pluralities Acts had done their duty almost too well, and they were too purely permissive in their operation. He hoped some impetus would be given to the consolidation of livings beyond the metropolis. Another way of approaching to an equalisation of incomes would be, leaving geographical considerations aside, to tax the richer livings for the benefit of the poorer. This system was already in operation in the metropolis, and it should be carried out to a still greater extent. There were some, at least, who were able to contribute to the necessities of their poorer brethren, of whom there were a very large number. Two things, it appeared to him, were obvious—first, that the revenues of the Church of England were not so well distributed as they might be; and, secondly, however well distributed, they were really insufficient for the present wants which were rapidly increasing. (Hear, hear.) One of the great difficulties which the Church of England had to contend with in endeavouring to meet the requirements of the masses in large towns, was, not so much to find churches, as to provide endowments for them. The Queen Anne's Bounty, the object of which was to augment the smaller livings, was often a burden to them, because its funds were levied on a valuation condemned thirty-five years ago, and which operated so that livings worth a mere trifle had to pay 30*l.* or 40*l.* a year as first fruits, and 3*l.* or 4*l.* as tenths, while some of the larger livings got off with the payment of a few shillings. As regarded the other branch of the inquiry, he held that lay patronage was one of the greatest bulwarks of the Church of England. At various times there had been great scandals connected with the exercise of it, but abuse had long since reached its climax, and was now rapidly diminishing. The reason was that patrons now recognised the fact that an appointment to the cure of souls was a sacred and honourable trust, which ought to be exercised for the benefit of the parishioners; and any scheme that extended lay patronage would confer benefit on the Church. He had been told that it would be dangerous to the Church to promote an inquiry, which would show up its weak places; but, so far from fearing the light of day, the Church might safely court it. There was plenty of information of one kind and another scattered in Clerical Lists, Directories, and Calendars, from which it was easy to compile statistics; but he would prefer that the truth should be set forth in a complete and authoritative form rather than have statements drawn from incorrect sources and published in a distorted form. The result of such an inquiry would be to show that the Church of England, instead of being in possession of property to which she had no right, had been deprived of very much to which she had a right; and that, instead of there being a superabundance of wealth within her, the cases of individual superfluity were extremely few, and on the whole there was no superfluity at all. If he had ventured to recommend a course which some deemed rash and unwise, he had not done so without giving the matter the best consideration. He held the question of the maintenance of the Established Church to be one, not of comparative expediency or advantage, but one of vital importance to the nation; because disestablishment meant, not the establishment of some other form of national religion, but it meant the severance of religion from the national life altogether. It would be impossible, even if it were prudent, much longer to leave things as they are; and it would be far better that the Church should take these matters into her own hands than that she should leave them to be dealt with by others. He had a strong conviction that reforms, such as were indicated—namely, the amendment of the laws of patronage and improved distribution of revenues—would conduce to extend the just influence of the Church of England and the promotion of the interests of true religion, to which considerations all others ought to be subordinated. With these views he seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Frome.

(*Continued on page* 695.)

Mr. Spurgeon has discovered that, while in seven Ritualistic churches in London only 7*l.* 18s. 2d. was subscribed to foreign missions, for a whole year, the choir of one alone cost 1,000*l.* a year.

THE CABMAN'S REST.—A curious little structure has just appeared in the streets of Birmingham. It is called the "cabman's rest," and is neatly made of stained wood and glass. It contains sitting accommodation for several men, and has a locker for their food. There is also an apparatus for cooking. The current expenses of the "cabman's rest" are to be defrayed by the subscriptions of the drivers who avail themselves of its advantages. Its cost has been about 70*l.*, and it is the gift of the town mission, who intend, it is stated, to supply it with literature of an "instructive and moral tendency."

to the nature, amount, and application of a certain description of Church property to which my hon. friend has scarcely referred, but the barest mention of which is calculated to suggest good *prima facie* grounds for this inquiry. I mean, sir, what is called cathedral property. Now, ever since the Reformation, the management of capitular estates has been more or less scandalously wasteful, the exercise of cathedral patronage more or less impure, and the amount of work done in return for immense disbursements more or less absurdly inadequate. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, it is no part of my intention to dwell upon the abuses and scandals of the past. I shall have quite enough to do during the course of the few remarks to which I may reasonably hope that the House will extend its indulgence, in sketching those of the present. But, sir, it is a lamentable fact that in spite of all our cry for cathedral reform, in spite of Acts of Parliament innumerable, in spite of commissions sitting for two years and a half at a time, what is called the cathedral question is as urgent and as ugly as ever it was. And in making this remark, I wish myself clearly to be understood not to say that the abuses and scandals are in themselves as flagrant as once they were; but that viewed in relation to a higher tone of public morality, a deeper sense of the claims of religion upon presumably religious corporation, and a sterner condemnation of ecclesiastical nepotism, idleness, and avarice, the present aspect of our cathedral system is as full of humiliation for the Church as in those days when every vice which flourished under it was veiled and obscured by a denser if not fouler atmosphere of public opinion. (Hear, hear.) Now, before I go further, let me remind the House what the value of this property really is. The last published returns to which I have had access of the revenue of capitular corporations, are contained in the report and appendix of the Cathedral Commission. They amounted in 1852 to upwards of 300,000*l.* a year, and the fee simple of this property is valued at 16,000,000*l.* sterling. A considerable portion of these revenues is derived from what are called the appropriate rectories. The annual value of the appropriations of 23 chapters in 1852 was 266,000*l.*; the value of the vicarages and perpetual curacies was 130,000*l.*, so that the final appropriations of the chapters amounted to 136,000*l.* The result of this system in many cases is to produce great hardship to the working clergy. Thus the tithes of Caddington amount to 1,036*l.*, and the value of the living to 233*l.*; the tithes of Willesden to 1,281*l.*, and the endowment of the living to 168*l.*, while the tithes of Kingsbury are 681*l.*, and the living is endowed with only 89*l.* But to return to the gross income of the chapters, which, in 1852, amounted to more than 300,000*l.* More than half of it—viz., 160,000*l.*—went in a lump as stipends to deans and canons, 40,000*l.* more to other officers and members, and for pensions. And bear in mind that, in addition to their stipends, deans and canons are in possession of some of the richest preferments of the Church. The chapter patronage in 1852 amounted to 169,000*l.* per annum, and when the Cathedral Commission put this query to the chapters—"What is the practice of the chapters with respect to the nomination or appointment to benefices in the patronage of the chapters?"—in the vast majority of instances the reply was, "Members recommend and appoint in fixed rotation either to themselves or their nominees." (Hear, hear.) Now, what do we get in return for all these disbursements? What does the dean do for his 1,000*l.* to 3,000*l.* a year? and what do the canons do for their 500*l.* to 1,000*l.*, amply supplemented by other preferments? I will not take external evidence. It shall be all drawn from the bosom of the Church, indeed, from the bosom of the chapters. What does Dean Alford say? Speaking of the office of dean, in his reply to the circular of the archbishops, to which I shall presently refer, he says, "That office is in many of our cathedrals practically useless. The dean, while nominally the head of the cathedral body, is almost without employment. His power even to preach above his statutable three or more times in the year is called in question." "The time," said the Bishop of St. David's, when examined before the commission, "seems to me not far distant when it will be difficult to discover any function proper to a dean which might not be as conveniently exercised by a bishop residing close to a cathedral." And when the then Bishop of Carlisle was asked what objection there was to throwing the duties of the deans upon the bishops, all the reply which he could make was, "If the office of bishop and dean could be united it would be a confession that one of them was unnecessary." ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) Now for the canons. The usual number of canons attached to a cathedral is four—four men to do the work of one. Suppose any hon. gentleman was to arrange for the management of his estate on this principle, and was to appoint four stewards, each to reside on the estate for three months out of the twelve. (Hear, hear.) The whole system is preposterous and indefensible. Why, the hon. member for the University of Cambridge, in a speech at the Church Congress at Liverpool in 1869, speaks of the canons as "canons with no definite duties." And in a speech immediately preceding that of the hon. gentleman, Canon Trevor, of York, thus described the canon residentiary:—"This poor canon in residence has lately been described by an eminent dignitary of the Church as a man who receives a thousand a year for doing nothing but eating white soup. Now, in the first place, there are very few canons in England who get a thousand a year, and in the next place, I take it upon myself to say that a great deal more than white soup is eaten by all the canons in England. It is possible, indeed," he goes on to say, "that the archdeacon was speaking figuratively, and meant to describe the quality of the spiritual food which canons in residence imbibe or distribute to the people around them, and, if that is the case, I am afraid I cannot correct him, because, as far as my impression goes, canons in residence have no spiritual duties at all. In the cathedral of York there was one sermon in the year to be preached by the four residentiaries among them, but Her Majesty, with a gracious and singular consideration for the burthens of the clergy, has abolished the anniversary on which that sermon was preached, and that duty no longer exists." ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) But, sir, I may be told that, although the canons have no spiritual duties and the dean is a sinecurist, yet, that these offices are useful, however expensive, because they afford a calm and dignified retreat for men actively engaged in theological studies, and preparing works beneficial to the Church and to the world. Again I go to a dean for the reply. "Take a circuit," replies Dean Close, "through the whole canonical bodies, and how many canons will you find thus occupied? or where can you find one whose patron selected him for such a purpose? No, the truth must be told: as long as canonries are practically sinecures, tenable with the richest rectories and other preferments, the temptation is, and will be, too strong for the virtue of patrons, who will prefer kindred and friends and interest to all the claims of men of learning, whether old or young." Talk of learning, science, scholarship, contemplation, and a hundred other imaginary qualifications for deaneries and canonries. The one only qualification in past times has been a name, and that the name of the bishop of the diocese." (Cheers and laughter.) But we were paying deans and canons 160,000*l.* a year in order that we might present a working model always going of what public worship ought to be—which is open to inspection at all times so that our parish churches may form their services upon it. "You have," said the hon. gentleman the member for the University—"you have the stated, ever-recurring worship of Almighty God unstimulated by any extraordinary spasmodic incident." But Dr. Sebastian Wesley, of Winchester Cathedral, an eminent composer and organist, in the evidence which he gave before the committee, stated that "he had often heard cathedral service so performed as to suggest the idea that it were better to abolish music than to continue the abuse of so beautiful an art on occasion of any direct appeal to the Deity." But we are told that the cathedral is the musical school of the diocese. "In fact, I think," he goes on to say, "of music in all its importance at cathedrals being essentially under the guidance of capitular bodies is enough to account for the deficiency for which the cathedral service is remarkable." And I maintain that the working model of Divine worship is not attractive—and that you cannot get the public to inspect it. When my right hon. friend the member for Liskeard brought forward his motion on cathedrals many years ago, he took the pains to ascertain the average attendance at morning and evening service on week-days in our cathedrals. He found that at Durham the congregation numbered 18, and the officials 33; at Peterborough 7, and the officials 12; at Lincoln 8, and the officials 24, and so forth. Nor have we any reason to suppose that things are much better now, when the Dean of Manchester in his reply to the archbishops seems to think it matter for encouragement and congratulation that out of a population of half a million you have achieved the marvellous feat of collecting some fifteen or twenty persons at morning and evening prayer to attend "the stated ever-recurring worship of Almighty God, stimulated by any extraordinary spasmodic effort." But, having failed to draw the people, you tell us now that these services are held less for the "edification of man" than for "the glory of God." Is God glorified by a beggarly array of empty benches? (Cheers.) And, if this be the spectacle in our huge cities, what must it be where the cathedral is situated either in a wilderness, like St. David's, or in a paltry little town like Ely or Lichfield, with the population of a second-rate Yorkshire village? "Unfortunately," says the Dean of Ely, "population is locomotive and cathedrals are not. If I could, by the help of the Great Eastern steamship or Great Eastern Railway, set down Ely Cathedral in the midst of Liverpool, no doubt I could answer certain questions concerning the usefulness of that noble building in a more complete manner than I can now, but," he adds pathetically, "cathedrals will not march." Quite right, Mr. Dean, "cathedrals will not march." They never have marched, and march they never will, to the end of the chapter. If any hon. member doubts that, let him peruse a correspondence lately presented to the House—"Copy of Suggestions drawn up by Cathedral Bodies for the improvement of Cathedral Establishments." Alarmed, no doubt, by the cry for cathedral reform, and the fact that, although the Cathedral Commission, after sitting two years and a half, reported—now nineteen years ago—and not a single one of the suggestions which they made has been adopted. The archbishops addressed a circular letter to the deans, asking for suggestions of any change which they might consider important. And what were the replies? Half the deans appear to have returned no reply whatever, or, at all events, these replies were deemed wholly unfit for publication, for they find no place in this return. But let us look to the replies which were vouchsafed. Canterbury recommends the abolition of the present capitular system. Whereupon the canons, in a great fright, feel bound to inform the archbishop that the dean's views "are not to be regarded as the views of the deans' brethren." Then comes the Dean of Carlisle, recommending that the number of canons should be reduced, and the Dean of Chester, explaining why he thinks "some decisive handling of the subject by authority is urgently required." Then we come to the Dean of Durham, who says quite cheerfully, "We have held our chapter, and in direct reply to your grace's inquiries, I beg leave to say that I cannot suggest any change I consider a of great importance to the cathedral over which I preside; and that all my brethren of the chapter, except one whom I have not been able to consult, regard the subject in the same light." I have no doubt they do. In 1852 the revenues of the chapter were 57,800*l.*, and in 1857 they had increased to 81,000*l.* The dean receives 3,000*l.*, and the canons 1,000*l.* a piece. Durham exhibits a fine illustration of a Cathedral Establishment full-blown. In 1852 it consisted of the dean, 9 canons, 1 sub-dean, 6 minor canons, 10 singing-men, 2 masters of the choristers, 10 choristers, 5 supernumeraries, 4 teachers of boys in the grammar-school, 18 scholars in the same school, 8 pew-men (not canons), 30 poor women called Church widows, 2 vergers, 8 bell-ringers, 8 sub-vergers, 1 porter, 1 cook, a receiver, a deputy-receiver, a treasurer, a deputy-treasurer, a presenter, a sacrist, an organist, a librarian, a clerk of the works, a bailiff, a land-agent, a calling agent, an agent for special estates, a constable, a gardener, a woodman, in all 149. (Laughter and cheers.) Durham is perfectly contented, and has no change to suggest to the archbishops. Then comes Gloucester. Gloucester is bold; he says, "No injury would result to the Church or city if three out of the four canons were suspended." I pass on to Ely, Sir, Ely says that he "should exceedingly deprecate any further cutting down of our cathedral establishments." Now, Ely consists of two parishes, one of 2,000 and the other of 4,000 inhabitants. Ely, we may remember, "does not march," and the revenues of Ely are 16,214*l.* Those of Exeter are 11,431, and Exeter is for no change. Llandaff informs us, "There is no record of any residence having been kept by the canons until 1857, and there had been for the last 100 years and more no organ in the cathedral, and no attempt at choral services, while half the building has been for more than a century in utter ruin." Manchester is all for *more* canons. When we get to Norwich we are confronted by an extract from "Il Penseroso," and a homily on the value of monastic institutions, a recommendation to leave things pretty much as they are, and that every dean and canon should emit once in five years some contribution to theological literature—I pity theological literature. (Laughter. St. Asaph advises a reduction in the number of canons. Peterborough and St. Paul's deprecate earnestly any such thing. York recommends permanent residence; and at Rochester the dean is too old to recommend anything. (Laughter.) Now, I will ask any candid Churchman in the House whether he hopes anything from this correspondence—or whether it is not manifest that the cathedrals will not march? In fact, the Rev. Mr. Ryle says, representing as he does one of that bundle of sects which collectively we call the Church of England. "Cathedral establishments are like a ship which has run aground at high water in a spring-tide. The tide has left her. She will never afloat again. Their theory has clean broken down; the public has lost faith in them. The facts of their centuries of working are dead against them. Their occupation is gone. They are past mending and patching up." But they swallow up the proceeds of a huge mass of public property, and if I had not addressed the House at such length, I should have liked to have said a few words with reference to the incredible avarice of these corporations. (Hear, hear.) Through their system of fines and leasing, it is calculated that they have sacrificed three-fourths of the value of the estates under their charge. Now, sir, we maintain that all this calls aloud for inquiry. You have enormous revenues—and revenues which but for the avarice of those who have enjoyed them would have been more enormous, still diverted from the purposes for which they were intended into the pockets of sinecurists and pluralists. You have no adequate return whatever for these immense disbursements. "I will defy anyone to put his finger on any one of our cathedrals since the time of St. Augustine that has contributed largely to evangelisation." These are not my words, but Lord Harrowby's. "What is the use of a cathedral?" says the Bishop of Peterborough. "Principally to cultivate canons and to grow vergers." (Laughter.) Now all this property, as the present Attorney-General says, "has been given and taken subject to State control, on State terms, upon conditions laid down from time to time by the State, and liable to be altered by the power which has laid it down." All this property—every penny of it—we claim as national property. It was all acquired by the Church as a national institution. The Church was then, and is now, "the nation ecclesiastically considered." "I know no difference," said Lord Eldon, "as to the persons of whom they are composed between the Church and the State. The Church is the State and the State is the Church." The State, therefore, has a perfect right to inquire

into the application of them, and all other revenues of the Church, and if need be resume them. My hon. friend has a perfect right to initiate, if he can, that inquiry. He has stated the grounds upon which he desires to do so. In dealing with one branch alone of this question, I have endeavoured still further to strengthen his *primâ facie* case. The evidence which I have adduced has been brought from Church sources alone. Not a word have I quoted from the lips of those enemies of all that is good, the political Dissenters. (Laughter.) But it is as a political Dissenter that I speak. (Hear, hear.) I am not ashamed of the title. I would give little for the politics of the man whose religion was not at the bottom of them. (Cheers.) I think I should be ashamed if I belonged to a religious community in which scandals like those to which I have referred were permitted quietly to continue. (Hear, hear.) I think I should be still more ashamed of belonging to that religious community, and with these scandals before my eyes, should resist this inquiry on the ground that it would prove damaging and dangerous to my Church. (Hear, hear.) Sir, if the Church of England is to retain her position of supremacy, she must be prepared to meet fearlessly and cheerfully all such inquiries as this. (Cheers.) I will go a step further and say, if in a country in which all men are presumed to be equal before the law, one form of religious belief and one system of Church Government are to be exalted in perpetuity at the expense and to the disparagement of all the rest, the Church must be prepared to prove that these scandals are but accidents—accidents to be deplored, but still accidents—and not as we contend the necessary offspring of that embrace of the Church by the State; the disastrous character of which it will be our object and our duty hereafter to expose. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. HUGHES did not offer the amendment of which he had given notice as an answer to the hon. member for Bradford, because he believed inquiry would result in good rather than evil to the Church. He therefore asked the House to recommend inquiry, adding only that the commissioners should proceed with a view to reform, and not to disestablishment. He commended the tone of the speech of the hon. member for Bradford, but the speech of his seconder amounted simply to abuse of the Church. ("No, no," and cheers.) As far as episcopal and cathedral establishments were concerned, the information asked for by the hon. member was at his disposal. ("No, no.") Then the hon. member had never studied the reports, in which he could obtain all he asked for. No doubt the real question at issue was disestablishment. The ground for entire severance rested on the theory that the sole duty of the State was the preservation of body and goods, a theory that would not hold water. The State should seek to build up a wise and an understanding nation, but how could this be done if it concerned itself with nothing but body and goods? Was it for the good of the nation that the ordinances and ministrations of religion should be brought home to every citizen? Even the hon. member for Bradford would admit that it was, yet had voluntaryism done that, or could it do it? ("Yes.") If voluntaryism was so much better than a State Church for that purpose, how did it happen that for thirty years voluntaryism had been going backwards and the Church going forwards? (Hear, hear.) What were the facts? According to the returns of the Census Commission, it was shown that, of the 5,810 chapels which had been licensed to various denominations in this country between the years 1841 and 1850, in 1851 1,413 had actually disappeared. A subsequent return showed that between 1851, and May, 1870, 2,401 more licensed chapels had disappeared. Looking to those facts, then, was voluntaryism a system which could supply the ministrations of religion to every citizen? In the "Baptist Year Book" for 1872, he found it stated that one-fourth of the existing chapels were without ministers, while in another fourth the services, which were held only on Sundays, were conducted by persons who on other days were engaged in business. On the showing of the community itself, in one-half the existing Baptist chapels there were not the ordinary and proper ministrations of religion. (Hear, hear.) The reason for this neglect was that voluntaryism must follow the purse, and could not do work in the four quarters of great cities—(Hear, hear)—as was admitted by Mr. Spurgeon in 1861, when he said it was of no use to try to establish chapels in certain places, because they were poor. But if voluntaryism could not provide the ministrations of religion in the poorest quarters, he asked whether the Church did not do that? (Hear, hear.) He not only maintained that it did, but he also asserted that there was no agency which could do so except a body which was in some way connected with the State. If this connection with the State were a great disadvantage, why had not the sects overtaken the Church? If, on the other hand, it were an advantage, why should they remove that which must be admitted to be good for this country? It was said that those who supported this resolution desired to bring about equality and freedom; but the latter they already had, and the former they could obtain for all purposes except the wretched one of precedence. The real difference between the Established Church and the Nonconformists was that the sects must necessarily be narrow, while the Church must be broad. (Hear, hear.) This was shown by comments which were made at the recent Baptist general meeting respecting the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of Mr. Bennett, when it was said "they dare not suffer themselves to be comprehended in a Church which saps the spiritual life by receiving maintenance from the State." He, however, could not imagine how it could be more sapped by that than by receiving maintenance, as most voluntary bodies did, from John Smith, the great grocer, or any other person of that kind. (Hear, hear.) It was also stated that "the judgment proves the Church to be Romanist as well as Rationalist." (Cheers from below the gangway on the Ministerial side.) According to the views of those who supported the hon. member for Bradford, it was desirable that a religious body should have some particular Shibboleth, and that a man should have to exercise an act of volition to get into that body; but what most commended the Church of England to him was that an Englishman had to exercise an act of volition to get out of it. (Hear, hear.) He put it to hon. members whether, if he did not belong to the Church of England, there was any religious body in this country that would admit him as one of its members? ("Hear," and laughter.) That the Church was as comprehensive as had been alleged was an argument in its favour, and while his hon. friends apparently liked to be connected with small separate sects, he deemed it a greater advantage and glory to belong to a body admitting men of many theological opinions. He liked a wood with various kinds of trees nourished by the same soil, air, and sun, all having an equal right to be included in it, while they preferred the elms, oaks, and firs planted out in separate places. He doubted whether they had considered the consequences of freeing so powerful a body as the Church of England from State control. According to the last report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the capitular and episcopal estates with which they dealt were of the value of 1,255,000*l.*, out of which 300,000*l.* was to be applied this year to the augmentation of poor livings, to meet an equal sum subscribed by the members of the Church for that purpose, similar sums having been so applied in previous years. The other revenues of the Church amounted to 10,000,000*l.* per annum. A body with such power and resources would as an independent corporation be too powerful, and we had seen in other countries the difficulty of making the action of such bodies compatible with good government. The hon. member might think, indeed, that those resources would be greatly reduced by taking away the glebe, tithes, and other property which belonged to the Church before the Toleration Act, the date to which he understood him to limit disendowment, but he believed that this deduction would scarcely amount to 2,000,000*l.* a-year. This question was now agitating all the nations of Europe, and he believed that if in Germany, Italy, or Spain there existed a body like the Church of England, able, with proper reforms, to meet all the spiritual destitution of the country, and yet so completely under the control of the State, such a solution would be eagerly accepted as an escape from the evils now threatening them. Despairing of their finding anything like so good a solution, he asked the House to accede to the proposed inquiry, but to do so as a step, not to disestablishment, but to reform. While the Ecclesiastical Commissioners gave full details as to episcopal and capitular revenues, it was impossible to get similar information as to parochial estates and other property. He believed there were very many cases in which there was work and no pay, more than 2,000 in which there was pay and no work, and 1,200 or 1,400 in which there was neither pay nor work. Some such inquiry was, therefore, necessary, in order to clear up anomalies as to patronage and show what reforms were required. The hon. and learned gentleman concluded by moving the omission of the words "the use of the Church of England," in order to substitute the following—"any ecclesiastical purposes; and that such commission may be instructed to consider what rearrangements in the system of parochial benefices may be needed for the better adjustment of parishes and incomes in the Church of England, and what amendments may be made in the laws relating to the patronage of benefices."

Mr. WELBY, rising to second the amendment, remarked that the original motion, though now cautiously worded, stood for many weeks on the paper with the words "disestablishment and disendowment" at the end of it, and that the fact of its being no longer a straightforward and honest resolution was an additional reason for rejecting it. He disclaimed any intention of carrying the war into the enemy's camp, or of depriving other denominations of a shilling of their endowments. He should not second the amendment if it had any such object. His sole desire was to improve and strengthen the Church of England, and let others compete with her as best they could. He hoped that assurance, in connection with the speech of his hon. and learned friend the member for Frome, would be a sufficient guarantee to the House that it was with that object and intention only that he now sought to discover the means by which some of the anomalies and abuses admitted to exist in connection with the temporalities of the Church of England might be corrected, and some closer approximation made in the pay of the clergy to the work they had to do and the social position they had to maintain. There were two reforms to which he would specially point—first, the rearrangement of the parochial system; and, secondly, the amendment of the law of patronage. He admitted the great difficulty of dealing with the second of these points, particularly with livings in private gift. But no good friend of the Church would deny that, with full regard to the rights of property, some reform in regard to them would be desirable. Few clergymen, he thought, were really overpaid. He had no wish to separate the clergy from their present connection with the land, or to place them in the position of State annuitants. He considered any process of general equalisation of livings both inexpedient and impracticable; but if they could put aside for a time all considerations of private interest great benefit might be effected by a little very simple rearrangement. He thought the Pluralities Acts had done their duty almost too well, and they were too purely permissive in their operation. He hoped some impetus would be given to the consolidation of livings beyond the metropolis. Another way of approaching to an equalisation of incomes would be, leaving geographical considerations aside, to tax the richer livings for the benefit of the poorer. This system was already in operation in the metropolis, and it should be carried out to a still greater extent. There were some, at least, who were able to contribute to the necessities of their poorer brethren, of whom there were a very large number. Two things, it appeared to him, were obvious—first, that the revenues of the Church of England were not so well distributed as they might be; and, secondly, however well distributed, they were really insufficient for the present wants which were rapidly increasing. (Hear, hear.) One of the great difficulties which the Church of England had to contend with in endeavouring to meet the requirements of the masses in large towns, was, not so much to find churches, as to provide endowments for them. The Queen Anne's Bounty, the object of which was to augment the smaller livings, was often a burden to them, because its funds were levied on a valuation condemned thirty-five years ago, and which operated so that livings worth a mere trifle had to pay 30*l.* or 40*l.* a year as first fruits, and 3*l.* or 4*l.* as tenths, while some of the larger livings got off with the payment of a few shillings. As regarded the other branch of the inquiry, he held that lay patronage was one of the greatest bulwarks of the Church of England. At various times there had been great scandals connected with the exercise of it, but abuse had long since reached its climax, and was now rapidly diminishing. The reason was that patrons now recognised the fact that an appointment to the cure of souls was a sacred and honourable trust, which ought to be exercised for the benefit of the parishioners; and any scheme that extended lay patronage would confer benefit on the Church. He had been told that it would be dangerous to the Church to promote an inquiry, which would show up its weak places; but, so far from fearing the light of day, the Church might safely court it. There was plenty of information of one kind and another scattered in Clerical Lists, Directories, and Calendars, from which it was easy to compile statistics; but he would prefer that the truth should be set forth in a complete and authoritative form rather than have statements drawn from incorrect sources and published in a distorted form. The result of such an inquiry would be to show that the Church of England, instead of being in possession of property to which she had no right, had been deprived of very much to which she had a right; and that, instead of there being a superabundance of wealth within her, the cases of individual superfluity were extremely few, and on the whole there was no superfluity at all. If he had ventured to recommend a course which some deemed rash and unwise, he had not done so without giving the matter the best consideration. He held the question of the maintenance of the Established Church to be one, not of comparative expediency or advantage, but one of vital importance to the nation; because disestablishment meant, not the establishment of some other form of national religion, but it meant the severance of religion from the national life altogether. It would be impossible, even if it were prudent, much longer to leave things as they are; and it would be far better that the Church should take these matters into her own hands than that she should leave them to be dealt with by others. He had a strong conviction that reforms, such as were indicated—namely, the amendment of the laws of patronage and improved distribution of revenues—would conduce to extend the just influence of the Church of England and the promotion of the interests of true religion, to which consideration all others ought to be subordinated. With these views he seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Frome.

(*Continued on page* 695.)

Mr. Spurgeon has discovered that, while in seven Ritualistic churches in London only 7*l.* 13*s.* 2*d.* was subscribed to foreign missions, for a whole year, the choir of one alone cost 1,000*l.* a year.

THE CABMAN'S REST.—A curious little structure has just appeared in the streets of Birmingham. It is called the "cabman's rest," and is neatly made of stained wood and glass. It contains sitting accommodation for several men, and has a locker for their food. There is also an apparatus for cooking. The current expenses of the "cabman's rest" are to be defrayed by the subscriptions of the drivers who avail themselves of its advantages. Its cost has been about 70*l.*, and it is the gift of the town mission, who intend, it is stated, to supply it with literature of an "instructive and moral tendency.

CAPITALISTS.—WANTED a PARTNER in a Business which is now returning £2,000 per annum, and with extra capital can be [illegible]. Any young gentleman wishing to learn a business, and who has his capital, will find it an excellent opening.—Address, stating amount of capital, G. W. R., care of the Publisher, 18, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, London, E.C.

THE *NONCONFORMIST* SUPPLEMENTS.

8 pp. each, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.

January 3, 1872, with a full analysis of the Report and Evidence contained in the Blue-books illustrating the Physical and Moral Condition of the Rural Population of England.

March 7, entitled, "The Real Danger of Religion in the Schools—not, Fact *v.* Sentiment." Extracts from the Reports of School Inspectors, &c.

April 10. "The Church Establishment in the Rural Parishes in Relation to Religion and to Nonconformists." Copious extracts from correspondence.

May 2. "Our Religious and Educational Societies—a Survey of their Objects, Resources, and Work."

Arthur Miall, 18, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, E.C.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

In future the *Nonconformist* will be supplied, post free, at the reduced price of

ONE GUINEA PER ANNUM,

to all subscribers who order the paper direct from this office, and are willing to pay the amount in one sum in advance.

Those subscribers who prefer to remit half-yearly or quarterly will be supplied with the paper on the same terms as heretofore.

The half-yearly subscription is 12s.; quarterly, 6s.

Published by ARTHUR MIALL (to whom it is requested that all Post-office Orders may be made payable), 18, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, E.C.

TO ADVERTISERS.

The Terms for Advertising in THE NONCONFORMIST are as follows:—

One Line	A Shilling.
Each additional Line . .	Sixpence.

There are, on an average, eight words in a line.

LEADER PAGE.—An extra charge of 2s. 6d. for every ten lines or under.

	s.	d.
For Situations Wanted, five lines . . .	2	0
„ Wanting Servants, &c.	2	0

A Liberal Reduction made on a Series for Educational and all other Advertisements.

*** As the Organ of a great and growing movement, the principal Weekly Journal among Dissenters, and a first-class Family Newspaper, the *Nonconformist* has become a very desirable medium for Advertisers. Since the beginning of 1872 there has been a large increase of Annual Subscribers as well as in the general circulation.

THE NONCONFORMIST is registered for transmission abroad.

The Nonconformist.

THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1872.

SUMMARY.

THE great international bugbear has vanished into space. On Tuesday last week the Alabama difficulty was settled, and settled easily, at Geneva. The arbitrators themselves cut the diplomatic knot which Mr. Fish and Earl Granville had vainly tried to untie. In an hour or two the difficulties, which only gathered strength by six months of wearisome negotiation, were utterly extinguished. On the day mentioned Count Sclopis stated that himself and his colleagues had "individually and collectively" come to the conclusion that the indirect claims were inadmissible by the accepted principles of international law, as a foundation for compensation or damages between nations. Mr. Bancroft Davis having obtained fresh instructions from Washington, subsequently reported that President Grant accepted the judgment as "determinative of the important principle of public law involved;" and on Thursday Lord Tenterden was able to announce that when these views were put into official forms, he was instructed to withdraw his request for an adjournment, and ask leave to put in his final summary of the arguments Great Britain relies upon, as provided for in the fifth clause of the treaty. Full explanations of the arrangement were given in both Houses of Parliament on Thursday evening, the act of exclusion has been completed before the Geneva Court, and that tribunal has adjourned for a time; after which the proper object of the arbitration will be dealt with.

We have commented elsewhere on what took place in the House of Commons on Friday, when that assembly restored the Ballot Bill substantially to its original shape. The Liberal majority proved in this case far more decided than their leaders. When the optional ballot clause came under consideration, Mr. Disraeli took the lead in defending it by ingenious and audacious arguments, which Mr. Gladstone felicitously ridiculed. A majority of 68 in a House of 540 members rejected the optional ballot amendments of the Lords. Then came the concession to the Upper House; though Ministers accepted the principle of the scrutiny to please the Lords, but with stringent safeguards, 137 of their supporters voted against it. The provision to use school boards as polling places was restored against the will of the Government without a division, but the extension of polling hours was rejected. On Monday the Commons completed their work by disagreeing with the Lords' proviso to limit the measure to 1880—that decision being voted by a majority of 81.

When this revising process was completed on Monday, Mr. W. E. Forster gave the Upper House a friendly warning, reminding the peers that the bill only affected the House of Commons; that it had been carried by large majorities, and had occupied a larger share of time than any previous measure; and that in deference to their views, and in order to facilitate its passage, concessions had been made, the need for which was not admitted by the majority. These friendly hints are, it seems, to be disregarded. According to report, the Lords will on Monday next, when the Commons' amendments are considered, resolutely adhere to the optional ballot; which would be a defiance of the majority of 68 in the Commons, and of course destroy the very essence of the bill—that of secret voting; and this impression is confirmed by the activity of the "constitutional" societies, which are industriously getting up petitions to support the Duke of Richmond. A vote in this sense would of course result in the withdrawal of the bill after the debates of two sessions; and if we are not mistaken, in an explosion of popular indignation, and in the raising of questions of more importance than the fate of even a Ballot Bill. The Tory peers could not more effectually restore the waning popularity of Mr. Gladstone's Government than by taking so rash and perilous a course.

Fortune smiles on the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The almost unexampled prosperity of the country is so improving all branches of the revenue, that Mr. Lowe has received the last quarter a million and a half more than during the corresponding period of last year. There is an increase in nearly every item. The income-tax accounts for more than half the amount, but the customs, excise and stamps, are unexpectedly productive. This is a promising beginning of the financial year. If we should have a good harvest—and our prospects in that respect are daily improving, and if there should be no commercial collapse, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will next April have to deal with a surplus of perhaps 5,000,000 sterling!

The treaty between France and Germany for the earlier liberation of the occupied districts has been signed and made public. It provides that if in two months the French Government pay twenty millions sterling, the departments of the Marne and Haute Marne will be evacuated. Two more will be surrendered to France in March next, if forty millions are paid; and the remaining provinces, including the fortress of Belfort, will be surrendered in 1875 when the remaining forty millions shall have been handed over; till which period the occupying German force will not be diminished—an onerous provision. There is soon to be a loan of eighty millions sterling open to public subscription, and if that is successful—as no doubt it will be—some new proposals will be made to hasten the evacuation of territory. The French people think the terms of the arrangement hard, but they have no choice but to accept them.

The Budget debates in the National Assembly increase in violence, owing partly to M. Thiers' infatuated adherence to the tax on raw materials, which will it is said almost ruin some trades, and be unproductive as well. The question is still under debate. The President has broken with the Right, who oppose the tax, and now patronises the deputies of the Left, assuring them that he will be a firm defender of the Republic. Altogether there is greater tension in French politics, owing to the continued interference and obstinacy of M. Thiers, and there is talk of the dissolution of the Chamber when the present session is ended. But the Government have no power to dissolve an unwilling Chamber.

Though the expected letters from Dr. Livingstone have not yet come to hand, the London representative of the *New York Herald* has published some interesting details relative to the intrepid explorer. Mr. Stanley, in seeking Dr. Livingstone, had many adventures and encountered serious perils before he met with the object of his search at Ujiji, "a pale-looking, grey-headed white man". He found the doctor in remarkably good health, stout and strong, quite undismayed by all that he had gone through, and eager only to finish the task he had imposed upon himself." Both had important news to communicate—Mr. Stanley to inform his host of several years of startling events in the world's history; Dr. Livingstone to recount his various experiences and discoveries. The great traveller, who has often been placed in very critical circumstances owing to illness and the desertions of his retainers, has been so persevering in his explorations that the natives set him down as insane. His continued journeys and observations "have," says Mr. Stanley, "established conclusively (1st) that the Portuguese Zambezi and the Chambezi are totally distinct streams; and (2nd) that the Chambezi is the head waters of the Nile. He discovered that, starting from about 11 degrees south, it rolled on until it attained the extraordinary length of 2,600 miles." Mr. Stanley left Dr. Livingstone at Unyanyembe last March, after they had together explored the northern end of the Lake Tanganyika, and spent many months in companionship. The doctor proposes to trace the Nile along the 180 miles of yet unvisited country, and to inspect the four fountains which are said to feed the Zualaba River which unites with the Chambezi. To complete this task, Dr. Livingstone estimates that he will require sixteen or eighteen months; Mr. Stanley, however, is of opinion that the work will occupy at least two years. May his health and life be preserved to return home in due time, and give his own account of his crowning achievements as a geographical discoverer!

In a few days the Baltimore Democratic Convention will meet for the purpose of choosing a candidate for the Presidential election. If, as is probable, that assembly should give the preference to Mr. Horace Greeley, there is, we are assured, great probability that he will defeat General Grant, who has greatly injured his prospects by the policy of his Government on the Washington Treaty. But the settlement just come to at Geneva may revive public feeling in favour of the present occupant of the White House.

THE ANSWER OF THE COMMONS TO THE PEERS.

THE House of Commons has sent the Ballot Bill back to the House of Lords with "an authoritative knock." It has given the amendments made by the Lords a fuller and more patient consideration than the Lords gave to the bill itself, and has rejected them by most decisive majorities. Whatever be the excuse which Lord Salisbury or the Duke of Richmond may suggest for further resistance to any part of the bill, they cannot now urge that the House of Commons does not know its own mind. When the Duke of Richmond proposed his amendments, he had a slight show of reason for stating that there was some hesitation in the Commons about enforcing secresy. The bill went up to the Lords as a bill for the enactment of a secret ballot. It admitted one small and practically not very important infringement of the principle of secresy, in allowing illiterate voters, after making public declaration that they were unable to read, to request the returning officer to fill up their papers for them in the presence of the agents. It omitted to enforce secresy on the actual voter by not attaching any penalty to the careless or wilful exhibition of his marked ballot paper; but it attached penalties to any attempt to induce a voter to exhibit his paper, or to any revelation of the nature of his vote by officials who might see it. The Lords were told, and were quite ready to believe, that these slight defects in the bill showed some hesitancy on the part of the House of Commons in enforcing secresy, and, by a small majority on a small vote, they resolved to try whether the Commons would consent to have every guarantee of secresy cast out of the bill. This was the real effect of the Lords' amendments; and the principle of "trying it on" was probably the actuating motive. Mr. Disraeli could only defend the changes thus made on the plea that they applied to all voters the principle the House had applied to the illiterate voter. The treatment of the illiterate voter was felt even by the Government to be a blot upon the bill; and by extending it to all other voters the blots were simply spread all over the measure, and its whole meaning destroyed. It was specially urged even by its advocates as a necessary exception which proved the rule of secresy; and in making this exceptional option the rule, the Lords simply made secret voting the exception under the bill. The House of Commons faltered a little

in the full application of the principle of compulsory secresy, and the Lords took instant advantage of the slight hesitation to challenge the principle; but a majority of 68 on a large division in the Commons has not only reaffirmed the principle, but has declared it to be vital to the measure.

The question of optional or compulsory ballot is the one point on which the Government was resolved to be firm. It is, indeed, absolutely essential to the bill. An optional ballot is so transparent a sham, that it can hardly be said to be a sham at all. It is open voting for all who need secresy, and optional secresy to those who feel no necessity for it. It makes the ballot easy and palatable to bribers and intimidators by specially exempting their victims from its operation. The scrutiny as it was put into the bill by the Lords, would have denied real secresy even to those who had been courageous enough to claim it. Indeed, the bill as it stood when the Lords sent it back to the Commons, said to the dependent voter, "Choose secresy at your peril, and when you have chosen it you shall not get it." In accepting the principle of scrutiny the Government has therefore been obliged to remodel even the one amendment of the Lords which is to stand. Mr. Forster has now done his best to harmonise the principle of scrutiny with that of secresy. The vote of a man who really votes in his own name, and without a bribe, will remain absolutely inviolable. There will be no chance of tracing it. The only votes which can be traced are those which, previously to the search, have been declared to be dishonest votes. The evil of this arrangement is that which Mr. H. James forcibly pointed out; its moral effect on timid voters. There is a vague sense in country districts of the great power which influential people have in London; and a farmer who dares to vote against his landlord will be haunted by the fear that the landlord or his agent, or somebody on his behalf, will manage to get at the papers and counterfoils and overhaul the votes. It is this consideration which induced so many Liberals to vote against the concession. Without this scrutiny the ballot would at once emancipate dependent voters; with it they will only gradually emancipate themselves. While, therefore, we regret that the amendment had to be accepted, we cannot regard it as in any way fatal to the real secresy of the ballot.

The reluctance shown on the Liberal side to concede even as much as this, indicated the firm temper of the House. The statement so much relied on in the House of Lords, that the Government had coerced the House of Commons into passing the bill, met with complete disproof. The House took the bill into its own hands, and in one or two points coerced the Government. Mr. Forster probably thought that as Education Minister he was bound once more to yield to ecclesiastical claims in accepting the amendment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, forbidding the use of schools as polling-places. The amendment was accepted by the House of Lords in the same way—on authority. It did not occur to the Lords that they were adding to the expense of elections; they were not thinking of the elections but of the schools and the archbishop. The House of Commons at once saw the amendment in its practical light, and Mr. Forster was obliged to yield to the general feeling of both sides of the House. Even Sir Rainald Knightley described the clause allowing the use of schools as polling-places as one of the best in the bill. It is simply making use of public property for an occasional and important public purpose. It is a step towards the recognition of the public duty to provide the means of taking the poll; and will considerably reduce the cost of elections to candidates. In the less important amendment of Lord Shaftesbury, the House again refused to follow its leader, but this time against the interest of the working classes. The polling hours will have to be extended till eight in the evening, and after the experience of one general election under the ballot, such an extension is sure to take place by almost unanimous consent. An extension to five in winter and seven in summer would, however, have been a valuable concession. The limitation of the bill to a duration of eight years was so absurd an amendment that even the objectors to the bill could hardly rally to vote for it. It may nevertheless be fought for by a House which looks on every part of the bill with distaste.

But we trust that on all these points in which the House of Commons has so decisively expressed its will, the House of Lords will have the good sense to yield. The only amendment which was discussed and carried by at all a full House of Lords, the House of Commons has accepted. The Lords may now dismiss their fears of personation; and pass the bill. The committee of the House of Commons who will confer with them, can at least declare that the House and its constituencies are in earnest, and they will have no difficulty in representing that the matter is one in which the electors and the elected have a right to choose for themselves; and in which, when their choice has been made, an hereditary House ought not to interfere.

GERMANY AND THE PAPACY.

THE Emperor of Germany has thrown down the gauntlet to the Pope, and all Europe is, or should be, looking towards the result of the conflict. The result may prove that nothing of equal importance in regard to ecclesiastical affairs has occurred in Europe since the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.

It has been obvious, for a long time, that the Ultramontane party have been actively at work in endeavouring to sap the foundations of German unity. This was known long previous to the war with France, but since the defeat of that Catholic Power the Ultramontane party has increased its efforts. No doubt the movement headed by Dr. Döllinger, which has commanded the sympathy of a large portion of the intelligent Catholic laity of Germany, has had its influence in provoking renewed exertions on the part of the Ultramontanists and especially of the Jesuits. But, practical action began long before this date. As soon as it was known that the Prussian Power would not recognise in any manner the claims of infallibility, the Jesuits set to work. A third of the population of Germany is Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholics are, for the most part, centred in certain States. Suppose that a disaffected feeling could be kept up amongst these States, and that, at some great national crisis, they could be induced to join their brethren of the same religion belonging to another Power, why should not Protestant Germany be conquered? That was the hope of the Ultramontane party in the last war, and they are now reaping the fruits of a somewhat too active and injudicious indulgence of that hope.

The bill for the expulsion of the Jesuits from Germany has passed by a majority of 131 to 93 votes; and, excepting a motion in favour of civil as opposed to ecclesiastical marriages and registration, was the last act of the recent session of the German Parliament. It is almost as severe as our own English law, embodied in the Catholic Emancipation Act; but, while our own law was never intended to be carried into effect, and was never more than a mere sop to the Evangelical clergy, the Prussian law will, undoubtedly, be put in force. The Act as it stands is severer than the bill that was introduced. Summarising it, from such information as has reached us, we find that it abolishes all convents and other establishments belonging to the Society of Jesuits, while power is given to the Government to abolish other religious societies as well, if it should see fit. The Government, also, has power to decide where the Jesuits shall, in future, reside, supposing that they choose to remain in Germany, as, no doubt, they will choose. It had been proposed to expel them from the country—the only effectual plan—but that proposition was ultimately abandoned. It is possible, however, to make conditions of residence more painful than a condition of exile. A Jesuit would scarcely feel very comfortable if fixed in a Moravian establishment, or domiciled in an exclusively Lutheran village. Nor, if a German, would he care to be banished to Schleswig-Holstein, nor, if a native Dane, to be compelled to take up his residence in Saxony. This, however, is the power which the Government holds. The institutions are to be utterly abolished, and the members, if they do not expatriate themselves, are to be dispersed at the will of the sovereign power. We suppose, however, that not even the German Government imagines that this will extinguish the Jesuit order. But, if it do not kill the snake, it will at least "scotch it." And more than this. There is probably no country in the world where the moral influences of the law are so great as they are in Germany. The moral influence of this law will be to make not merely Jesuitism, but all ultra-Catholicism, unpopular with the people, and thus to sap the very foundations of the Roman Catholic religion. More than this. We may feel pretty confident that, if the recent act should not be sufficiently effective, another and more effective one will supply its place. What has to be done will be done thoroughly.

That some assumed necessity exists for such a law has been sufficiently proved. No State is obliged to harbour a host of traitors conspiring against its own safety, but it is an open question whether law is the best of all instruments for converting traitors into loyal men. It may defeat immediate designs, but it can scarcely effect its own higher purposes. On this occasion, however, there has been severe provocation, and, according to the last accounts, they will not be wanting the opportunity for making sweeping measures. The Ultramontane journals openly announce that the Pope will be avenged upon Germany by means of the International. "In fulfilment of this threat," says the correspondent of the *Times*, "we have already a strike of 20,000 miners in Westphalia, the movement notoriously originating with the more devout and priest-ridden portion of the hands. Such being the case, is it to be wondered at that the anti-Jesuit law has been confirmed by the Federal Council in the severer form voted by the Imperial Government? As appears from recent official reports, the law will affect 738 persons, which is the number of avowed Jesuits in Germany. This is about 500 more than was admitted by the Ultramontane members in the recent debates."

But the battle between Germany and the Papacy is not being fought out on this ground alone. We now have the spectacle of an Ultramontane bishop refusing to relieve a person from excommunication, although the Imperial Government has commanded him to do so. His answer is that, in spiritual matters, he is the servant of the Pope alone, an answer that may satisfy the Pope, but which is not likely to satisfy Prince Bismarck. Another matter of conflict is the peremptory dismissal of the Catholic school brothers and sisters from the education of the children, while, at the present moment an agreement is being forwarded between Germany and Italy, and possibly, also, Austria, for securing an anti-Ultramontane Pope on the critical occasion of the next Papal election.

The truth is that, in this matter at least, Germany represents the culture and intellect of Europe in conflict with the bastard ecclesiasticism that has been inherited from the middle ages. We are fighting much the same fight here, at a great disadvantage, for here this ecclesiasticism has just been pronounced to be legally entitled to the endowments granted by the State to the Episcopalian Church. Germany fights at greater advantage. Who does not know that she will win? Who does not know that we, too, shall win? There never was an age when the preposterous claims of priestcraft could have been advanced with less chance of a wide and lasting success than the age in which we now live.

THE SUCCESS OF THE ARBITRATION.

FOR the first time in the history of modern Europe a Court of Arbitration has been formally constituted for the purpose of settling an international dispute which a few years ago could only have been terminated by the brutal arbitrement of the sword. The friends of human progress throughout the world regarded this great experiment with the keenest anxiety and interest. They knew that if the experiment succeeded, it would establish such a precedent as would make it the harbinger of peace and good-will among men; while, on the other hand, they saw that its failure would necessarily involve the abandonment of any similar attempt for at least a generation to come. Just as the battle of Waterloo decided the fate of Europe for fifty years, so the success or failure of the Geneva arbitration could not fail to affect the welfare of every nation in Christendom for perhaps an equal period of time. The occurrence therefore of serious differences between the two countries as to the meaning of the treaty and the scope of the arbitration might well excite the apprehensions of the friends of Peace. When it became manifest that these differences did not admit of easy adjustment, the prophets of evil aggravated the dangers of the situation by their irritating language; and but for the patience and self-control exhibited by Her Majesty's Government discussions would have taken place which, by wounding the *amour propre* of the American nation, and exciting the resentment of the Washington Cabinet, must have destroyed what little life yet remained in the treaty. No one can read the official correspondence without feeling that there were moments in the controversy between the two Governments when a single irritating word from Lord Granville's pen would have imperilled not only the treaty but the highest interests of civilisation.

Unfortunately, there were not wanting those who failed to appreciate the qualities of calmness and forbearance displayed by our Foreign Minister, and who, if the treaty had been wrecked in the shallow waters of diplomacy, would have hurled imputations of pusillanimity against Lord Granville, and ridiculed his persistent attempts at peace-making as freaks of an impotent sentimentality. With such critics, success alone is the test of statesmanship; but,

TO CAPITALISTS.—WANTED a PARTNER in a Business which is now returning about £2,000 per annum, and with extra capital can be [illegible]d. Any young gentleman wishing to learn a business, and use his capital, will find it an excellent opening.—Address, stating amount of capital, G. W. R., care of the Publisher, 18, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, London, E.C.

THE *NONCONFORMIST* SUPPLEMENTS.

8 pp. each, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.

January 3, 1872, with a full analysis of the Report and Evidence contained in the Blue-books illustrating the Physical and Moral Condition of the Rural Population of England.

March 7, entitled, "The Real Danger of Religion in the Schools; or, Fact *v.* Sentiment." Extracts from the Reports of School Inspectors, &c.

April 10. "The Church Establishment in the Rural Parishes in Relation to Religion and to Nonconformists." Copious extracts from correspondence.

May 2. "Our Religious and Educational Societies—a Survey of their Objects, Resources, and Work."

Arthur Miall, 18, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, E.C.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

In future the *Nonconformist* will be supplied, post free, at the reduced price of

ONE GUINEA PER ANNUM,

to all subscribers who order the paper direct from this office, and are willing to pay the amount in one sum in advance.

Those subscribers who prefer to remit half-yearly or quarterly will be supplied with the paper on the same terms as heretofore.

The half-yearly subscription is 12s.; quarterly, 6s.

Published by ARTHUR MIALL (to whom it is requested that all Post-office Orders may be made payable), 18, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, E.C.

TO ADVERTISERS.

The Terms for Advertising in THE NONCONFORMIST are as follows:—

One Line	A Shilling.
Each additional Line . .	Sixpence.

There are, on an average, eight words in a line.

LEADER PAGE.—An extra charge of 2s. 6d. for every ten lines or under.

	s.	d.
For Situations Wanted, five lines	2	0
„ Wanting Servants, &c.	2	0

A Liberal Reduction made on a Series for Educational and all other Advertisements.

*** As the Organ of a great and growing movement, the principal Weekly Journal among Dissenters, and a first-class Family Newspaper, the *Nonconformist* has become a very desirable medium for Advertisers. Since the beginning of 1872 there has been a large increase of Annual Subscribers as well as in the general circulation.

THE NONCONFORMIST is registered for transmission abroad.

The Nonconformist.

THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1872.

SUMMARY.

THE great international bugbear has vanished into space. On Tuesday last week the Alabama difficulty was settled, and settled easily, at Geneva. The arbitrators themselves cut the diplomatic knot which Mr. Fish and Earl Granville had vainly tried to untie. In an hour or two the difficulties, which only gathered strength by six months of wearisome negotiation, were utterly extinguished. On the day mentioned Count Sclopis stated that himself and his colleagues had "individually and collectively" come to the conclusion that the indirect claims were inadmissible by the accepted principles of international law, as a foundation for compensation or damages between nations. Mr. Bancroft Davis having obtained fresh instructions from Washington, subsequently reported that President Grant accepted the judgment as "determinative of the important principle of public law involved;" and on Thursday Lord Tenterden was able to announce that when these views were put into official forms, he was instructed to withdraw his request for an adjournment, and ask leave to put in his final summary of the arguments Great Britain relies upon, as provided for in the fifth clause of the treaty. Full explanations of the arrangement were given in both Houses of Parliament on Thursday evening, the act of exclusion has been completed before the Geneva Court, and that tribunal has adjourned for a time; after which the proper object of the arbitration will be dealt with.

We have commented elsewhere on what took place in the House of Commons on Friday, when that assembly restored the Ballot Bill substantially to its original shape. The Liberal majority proved in this case far more decided than their leaders. When the optional ballot clause came under consideration, Mr. Disraeli took the lead in defending it by ingenious and audacious arguments, which Mr. Gladstone felicitously ridiculed. A majority of 68 in a House of 540 members rejected the optional ballot amendments of the Lords. Then came the concession to the Upper House; though Ministers accepted the principle of the scrutiny to please the Lords, but with stringent safeguards, 137 of their supporters voted against it. The provision to use school boards as polling places was restored against the will of the Government without a division, but the extension of polling hours was rejected. On Monday the Commons completed their work by disagreeing with the Lords' proviso to limit the measure to 1880—that decision being voted by a majority of 81.

When this revising process was completed on Monday, Mr. W. E. Forster gave the Upper House a friendly warning, reminding the peers that the bill only affected the House of Commons; that it had been carried by large majorities, and had occupied a larger share of time than any previous measure; and that in deference to their views, and in order to facilitate its passage, concessions had been made, the need for which was not admitted by the majority. These friendly hints are, it seems, to be disregarded. According to report, the Lords will on Monday next, when the Commons' amendments are considered, resolutely adhere to the optional ballot; which would be a defiance of the majority of 68 in the Commons, and of course destroy the very essence of the bill—that of secret voting; and this impression is confirmed by the activity of the "constitutional" societies, which are industriously getting up petitions to support the Duke of Richmond. A vote in this sense would of course result in the withdrawal of the bill after the debates of two sessions; and if we are not mistaken, in an explosion of popular indignation, and in the raising of questions of more importance than the fate of even a Ballot Bill. The Tory peers could not more effectually restore the waning popularity of Mr. Gladstone's Government than by taking so rash and perilous a course.

Fortune smiles on the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The almost unexampled prosperity of the country is so improving all branches of the revenue, that Mr. Lowe has received the last quarter a million and a half more than during the corresponding period of last year. There is an increase in nearly every item. The income-tax accounts for more than half the amount, but the customs, excise and stamps, are unexpectedly productive. This is a promising beginning of the financial year. If we should have a good harvest—and our prospects in that respect are daily improving, and if there should be no commercial collapse, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will next April have to deal with a surplus of perhaps 5,000,000 sterling!

The treaty between France and Germany for the earlier liberation of the occupied districts has been signed and made public. It provides that if in two months the French Government pay twenty millions sterling, the departments of the Marne and Haute Marne will be evacuated. Two more will be surrendered to France in March next, if forty millions are paid; and the remaining provinces, including the fortress of Belfort, will be surrendered in 1875 when the remaining forty millions shall have been handed over; till which period the occupying German force will not be diminished—an onerous provision. There is soon to be a loan of eighty millions sterling open to public subscription, and if that is successful—as no doubt it will be—some new proposals will be made to hasten the evacuation of territory. The French people think the terms of the arrangement hard, but they have no choice but to accept them.

The Budget debates in the National Assembly increase in violence, owing partly to M. Thiers' infatuated adherence to the tax on raw materials, which will it is said almost ruin some trades, and be unproductive as well. The question is still under debate. The President has broken with the Right, who oppose the tax, and now patronises the deputies of the Left, assuring them that he will be a firm defender of the Republic. Altogether there is greater tension in French politics, owing to the continued interference and obstinacy of M. Thiers, and there is talk of the dissolution of the Chamber when the present session is ended. But the Government have no power to dissolve an unwilling Chamber.

Though the expected letters from Dr. Livingstone have not yet come to hand, the London representative of the *New York Herald* has published some interesting details relative to the intrepid explorer. Mr. Stanley, in seeking Dr. Livingstone, had many adventures and encountered serious perils before he met with the object of his search at Ujiji, "a pale-looking, grey-headed white man". He found the doctor in remarkably good health, stout and strong, quite undismayed by all that he had gone through, and eager only to finish the task he had imposed upon himself." Both had important news to communicate—Mr. Stanley to inform his host of several years of startling events in the world's history; Dr. Livingstone to recount his various experiences and discoveries. The great traveller, who has often been placed in very critical circumstances owing to illness and the desertions of his retainers, has been so persevering in his explorations that the natives set him down as insane. His continued journeys and observations "have," says Mr. Stanley, "established conclusively (1st) that the Portuguese Zambezi and the Chambezi are totally distinct streams; and (2nd) that the Chambezi is the head waters of the Nile. He discovered that, starting from about 11 degrees south, it rolled on until it attained the extraordinary length of 2,600 miles." Mr. Stanley left Dr. Livingstone at Unyanyembe last March, after they had together explored the northern end of the Lake Tanganyika, and spent many months in companionship. The doctor proposes to trace the Nile along the 180 miles of yet unvisited country, and to inspect the four fountains which are said to feed the Zualaba River which unites with the Chambezi. To complete this task, Dr. Livingstone estimates that he will require sixteen or eighteen months; Mr. Stanley, however, is of opinion that the work will occupy at least two years. May his health and life be preserved to return home in due time, and give his own account of his crowning achievements as a geographical discoverer!

In a few days the Baltimore Democratic Convention will meet for the purpose of choosing a candidate for the Presidential election. If, as is probable, that assembly should give the preference to Mr. Horace Greeley, there is, we are assured, great probability that he will defeat General Grant, who has greatly injured his prospects by the policy of his Government on the Washington Treaty. But the settlement just come to at Geneva may revive public feeling in favour of the present occupant of the White House.

THE ANSWER OF THE COMMONS TO THE PEERS.

THE House of Commons has sent the Ballot Bill back to the House of Lords with "an authoritative knock." It has given the amendments made by the Lords a fuller and more patient consideration than the Lords gave to the bill itself, and has rejected them by most decisive majorities. Whatever be the excuse which Lord Salisbury or the Duke of Richmond may suggest for further resistance to any part of the bill, they cannot now urge that the House of Commons does not know its own mind. When the Duke of Richmond proposed his amendments, he had a slight show of reason for stating that there was some hesitation in the Commons about enforcing secresy. The bill went up to the Lords as a bill for the enactment of a secret ballot. It admitted one small and practically not very important infringement of the principle of secresy, in allowing illiterate voters, after making public declaration that they were unable to read, to request the returning officer to fill up their papers for them in the presence of the agents. It omitted to enforce secresy on the actual voter by not attaching any penalty to the careless or wilful exhibition of his marked ballot paper; but it attached penalties to any attempt to induce a voter to exhibit his paper, or to any revelation of the nature of his vote by officials who might see it. The Lords were told, and were quite ready to believe, that these slight defects in the bill showed some hesitancy on the part of the House of Commons in enforcing secresy, and, by a small majority on a small vote, they resolved to try whether the Commons would consent to have every guarantee of secresy cast out of the bill. This was the real effect of the Lords' amendments; and the principle of "trying it on" was probably the actuating motive. Mr. Disraeli could only defend the changes thus made on the plea that they applied to all voters the principle the House had applied to the illiterate voter. The treatment of the illiterate voter was felt even by the Government to be a blot upon the bill; and by extending it to all other voters the blots were simply spread all over the measure, and its whole meaning destroyed. It was specially urged even by its advocates as a necessary exception which proved the rule of secresy; and in making this exceptional option the rule, the Lords simply made secret voting the exception under the bill. The House of Commons faltered a little

in the full application of the principle of compulsory secresy, and the Lords took instant advantage of the slight hesitation to challenge the principle; but a majority of 68 on a large division in the Commons has not only reaffirmed the principle, but has declared it to be vital to the measure.

The question of optional or compulsory ballot is the one point on which the Government was resolved to be firm. It is, indeed, absolutely essential to the bill. An optional ballot is so transparent a sham, that it can hardly be said to be a sham at all. It is open voting for all who need secresy, and optional secresy to those who feel no necessity for it. It makes the ballot easy and palatable to bribers and intimidators by specially exempting their victims from its operation. The scrutiny as it was put into the bill by the Lords, would have denied real secresy even to those who had been courageous enough to claim it. Indeed, the bill as it stood when the Lords sent it back to the Commons, said to the dependent voter, "Choose secresy at your peril, and when you have chosen it you shall not get it." In accepting the principle of scrutiny the Government has therefore been obliged to remodel even the one amendment of the Lords which is to stand. Mr. Forster has now done his best to harmonise the principle of scrutiny with that of secresy. The vote of a man who really votes in his own name, and without a bribe, will remain absolutely inviolable. There will be no chance of tracing it. The only votes which can be traced are those which, previously to the search, have been declared to be dishonest votes. The evil of this arrangement is that which Mr. H. James forcibly pointed out; its moral effect on timid voters. There is a vague sense in country districts of the great power which influential people have in London; and a farmer who dares to vote against his landlord will be haunted by the fear that the landlord or his agent, or somebody on his behalf, will manage to get at the papers and counterfoils and overhaul the votes. It is this consideration which induced so many Liberals to vote against the concession. Without this scrutiny the ballot would at once emancipate dependent voters; with it they will only gradually emancipate themselves. While, therefore, we regret that the amendment had to be accepted, we cannot regard it as in any way fatal to the real secresy of the ballot.

The reluctance shown on the Liberal side to concede even as much as this, indicated the firm temper of the House. The statement so much relied on in the House of Lords, that the Government had coerced the House of Commons into passing the bill, met with complete disproof. The House took the bill into its own hands, and in one or two points coerced the Government. Mr. Forster probably thought that as Education Minister he was bound once more to yield to ecclesiastical claims in accepting the amendment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, forbidding the use of schools as polling-places. The amendment was accepted by the House of Lords in the same way—on authority. It did not occur to the Lords that they were adding to the expense of elections; they were not thinking of the elections but of the schools and the archbishop. The House of Commons at once saw the amendment in its practical light, and Mr. Forster was obliged to yield to the general feeling of both sides of the House. Even Sir Rainald Knightley described the clause allowing the use of schools as polling-places as one of the best in the bill. It is simply making use of public property for an occasional and important public purpose. It is a step towards the recognition of the public duty to provide the means of taking the poll; and will considerably reduce the cost of elections to candidates. In the less important amendment of Lord Shaftesbury, the House again refused to follow its leader, but this time against the interest of the working classes. The polling hours will have to be extended till eight in the evening, and after the experience of one general election under the ballot, such an extension is sure to take place by almost unanimous consent. An extension to five in winter and seven in summer would, however, have been a valuable concession. The limitation of the bill to a duration of eight years was so absurd an amendment that even the objectors to the bill could hardly rally to vote for it. It may nevertheless be fought for by a House which looks on every part of the bill with distaste.

But we trust that on all these points in which the House of Commons has so decisively expressed its will, the House of Lords will have the good sense to yield. The only amendment which was discussed and carried by at all a full House of Lords, the House of Commons has accepted. The Lords may now dismiss their fears of personation; and pass the bill. The committee of the House of Commons who will confer with them, can at least declare that the House and its constituencies are in earnest, and they will have no difficulty in representing that the matter is one in which the electors and the elected have a right to choose for themselves; and in which, when their choice has been made, an hereditary House ought not to interfere.

GERMANY AND THE PAPACY.

THE Emperor of Germany has thrown down the gauntlet to the Pope, and all Europe is, or should be, looking towards the result of the conflict. The result may prove that nothing of equal importance in regard to ecclesiastical affairs has occurred in Europe since the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.

It has been obvious, for a long time, that the Ultramontane party have been actively at work in endeavouring to sap the foundations of German unity. This was known long previous to the war with France, but since the defeat of that Catholic Power the Ultramontane party has increased its efforts. No doubt the movement headed by Dr. Döllinger, which has commanded the sympathy of a large portion of the intelligent Catholic laity of Germany, has had its influence in provoking renewed exertions on the part of the Ultramontanists and especially of the Jesuits. But, practical action began long before this date. As soon as it was known that the Prussian Power would not recognise in any manner the claims of infallibility, the Jesuits set to work. A third of the population of Germany is Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholics are, for the most part, centred in certain States. Suppose that a disaffected feeling could be kept up amongst these States, and that, at some great national crisis, they could be induced to join their brethren of the same religion belonging to another Power, why should not Protestant Germany be conquered? That was the hope of the Ultramontane party in the last war, and they are now reaping the fruits of a somewhat too active and injudicious indulgence of that hope.

The bill for the expulsion of the Jesuits from Germany has passed by a majority of 131 to 93 votes; and, excepting a motion in favour of civil as opposed to ecclesiastical marriages and registration, was the last act of the recent session of the German Parliament. It is almost as severe as our own English law, embodied in the Catholic Emancipation Act; but, while our own law was never intended to be carried into effect, and was never more than a mere sop to the Evangelical clergy, the Prussian law will, undoubtedly, be put in force. The Act as it stands is severer than the bill that was introduced. Summarising it, from such information as has reached us, we find that it abolishes all convents and other establishments belonging to the Society of Jesuits, while power is given to the Government to abolish other religious societies as well, if it should see fit. The Government, also, has power to decide where the Jesuits shall, in future, reside, supposing that they choose to remain in Germany, as, no doubt, they will choose. It had been proposed to expel them from the country—the only effectual plan—but that proposition was ultimately abandoned. It is possible, however, to make conditions of residence more painful than a condition of exile. A Jesuit would scarcely feel very comfortable if fixed in a Moravian establishment, or domiciled in an exclusively Lutheran village. Nor, if a German, would he care to be banished to Schleswig-Holstein, nor, if a native Dane, to be compelled to take up his residence in Saxony. This, however, is the power which the Government holds. The institutions are to be utterly abolished, and the members, if they do not expatriate themselves, are to be dispersed at the will of the sovereign power. We suppose, however, that not even the German Government imagines that this will extinguish the Jesuit order. But, if it do not kill the snake, it will at least "scotch it." And more than this. There is probably no country in the world where the moral influences of the law are so great as they are in Germany. The moral influence of this law will be to make not merely Jesuitism, but all ultra-Catholicism, unpopular with the people, and thus to sap the very foundations of the Roman Catholic religion. More than this. We may feel pretty confident that, if the recent act should not be sufficiently effective, another and more effective one will supply its place. What has to be done will be done thoroughly.

That some assumed necessity exists for such a law has been sufficiently proved. No State is obliged to harbour a host of traitors conspiring against its own safety, but it is an open question whether law is the best of all instruments for converting traitors into loyal men. It may defeat immediate designs, but it can scarcely effect its own higher purposes. On this occasion, however, there has been severe provocation, and, according to the last accounts, there will not be wanting the opportunity for more sweeping measures. The Ultramontane journals openly announce that the Pope will be avenged upon Germany by means of the International. "In fulfilment of this threat," says the correspondent of the *Times*, "we have already a strike of 20,000 miners in Westphalia, the movement notoriously originating with the more devout and priest-ridden portion of the hands. Such being the case, is it to be wondered at that the anti-Jesuit law has been confirmed by the Federal Council in the severer form voted by the Imperial Government? As appears from recent official reports, the law will affect 738 persons, which is the number of avowed Jesuits in Germany. This is about 500 more than was admitted by the Ultramontane members in the recent debates."

But the battle between Germany and the Papacy is not being fought out on this ground alone. We now have the spectacle of an Ultramontane bishop refusing to relieve a person from excommunication, although the Imperial Government has commanded him to do so. His answer is that, in spiritual matters, he is the servant of the Pope alone, an answer that may satisfy the Pope, but which is not likely to satisfy Prince Bismarck. Another matter of conflict is the peremptory dismissal of the Catholic school brothers and sisters from the education of the children, while, at the present moment an agreement is being forwarded between Germany and Italy, and possibly, also, Austria, for securing an anti-Ultramontane Pope on the critical occasion of the next Papal election.

The truth is that, in this matter at least, Germany represents the culture and intellect of Europe in conflict with the bastard ecclesiasticism that has been inherited from the middle ages. We are fighting much the same fight here, at a great disadvantage, for here this ecclesiasticism has just been pronounced to be legally entitled to the endowments granted by the State to the Episcopalian Church. Germany fights at greater advantage. Who does not know that she will win? Who does not know that we, too, shall win? There never was an age when the preposterous claims of priestcraft could have been advanced with less chance of a wide and lasting success than the age in which we now live.

THE SUCCESS OF THE ARBITRATION.

FOR the first time in the history of modern Europe a Court of Arbitration has been formally constituted for the purpose of settling an international dispute which a few years ago could only have been terminated by the brutal arbitrement of the sword. The friends of human progress throughout the world regarded this great experiment with the keenest anxiety and interest. They knew that if the experiment succeeded, it would establish such a precedent as would make it the harbinger of peace and good-will among men; while, on the other hand, they saw that its failure would necessarily involve the abandonment of any similar attempt for at least a generation to come. Just as the battle of Waterloo decided the fate of Europe for fifty years, so the success or failure of the Geneva arbitration could not fail to affect the welfare of every nation in Christendom for perhaps an equal period of time. The occurrence therefore of serious differences between the two countries as to the meaning of the treaty and the scope of the arbitration might well excite the apprehensions of the friends of Peace. When it became manifest that these differences did not admit of easy adjustment, the prophets of evil aggravated the dangers of the situation by their irritating language; and but for the patience and self-control exhibited by Her Majesty's Government discussions would have taken place which, by wounding the *amour propre* of the American nation, and exciting the resentment of the Washington Cabinet, must have destroyed what little life yet remained in the treaty. No one can read the official correspondence without feeling that there were moments in the controversy between the two Governments when a single irritating word from Lord Granville's pen would have imperilled not only the treaty but the highest interests of civilisation.

Unfortunately, there were not wanting those who failed to appreciate the qualities of calmness and forbearance displayed by our Foreign Minister, and who, if the treaty had been wrecked in the shallow waters of diplomacy, would have hurled imputations of pusillanimity against Lord Granville, and ridiculed his persistent attempts at peace-making as freaks of an impotent sentimentality. With such critics, success alone is the test of statesmanship; but,

...ugh success has been achieved in spite of ...vaticinations, and as the result of the very ...y which they satirised, they are hardly in...ious enough to confess their error and to pay a tribute to the Minister whose supposed shortcomings have proved to be one of the finest examples of executive capacity. The more necessary is it therefore that those who are able to appreciate the service which Lord Granville has rendered to his country and to mankind should give him the praise to which he is fairly entitled, and acknowledge that, since the late Prince Consort took upon himself the responsibility of urging the Queen to require the modification of the Trent despatches, there has not been an occasion on which the adviser of the Crown has shown so much wisdom or self-restraint in the management of a complicated and difficult negotiation. In saying this, we are most anxious not to ignore the fact that Mr. Disraeli—unlike some of the less disciplined of his followers—has loyally preferred the well-being of the country to the selfish interests of a party, and that in taking a course so worthy of his position he has done justice to the historic side of his character.

Lord Granville's special merit is that when failure appeared to be most imminent, he refused to recognise its possibility; that he gave the American nation an opportunity of withdrawing the indirect claims without injury to their public spirit; and that when, owing to verbal disagreements, the Supplementary Article could not be concluded in time, he kept the Geneva Tribunal alive by proposing an adjournment of its sittings, and by insisting that its functions were not regulated by mere technical considerations. In what spirit the Tribunal itself met these persevering efforts of a wise diplomacy to prevent the collapse of the arbitration, Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone have already explained to an applauding Parliament. Nothing could better illustrate the real vitality which exists in a properly-constituted Court of arbitration than the determination of the Arbitrators themselves that they would assist the two Governments to a mutual understanding on the only points of difference which existed between them; and if it be true—as we have every reason to believe it is—that Mr. Adams himself was most emphatic in his advocacy of the withdrawal of the indirect claims from the purview of the Court, we have a right to claim for the Americans a large share of that credit which, as we have before remarked, is due to Lord Granville's moderation and good sense.

The Court took the sensible view that the proposed adjournment would be unproductive of any useful result, and might, if the two Governments failed to arrive at an agreement, render the whole arbitration abortive:—"This being "so, the arbitrators think it right to state, after "the most careful perusal of all that has been "urged on the part of the Government of the "United States in respect of these claims, they "have arrived, individually and collectively, at "the conclusion that these claims do not con"stitute, upon the principles of international "law applicable to such cases, good foundation "for an award of compensation or computation "of damages between nations, and should upon "such principles be wholly excluded from the "consideration of the tribunal in making its "award, if there were no disagreement between "the two Governments as to the competency of "the tribunal to decide thereon." After such a declaration, the Washington Cabinet—which had already surrendered the principle of the indirect claims—could no longer hold out upon points of form. The Sumnerian doctrine of consequential damages was dead: it only remained to celebrate its obsequies. These have taken place; the American agent has himself filled up the grave which the Arbitrators had dug; and we may now say with the clown in *Hamlet*, that "the houses that the grave-digger "makes last till doomsday." The arbitration, shorn of all complexities and hidden perils, will at once proceed; and there is reason to hope that, within a period of two months, we shall have the judgment of the Court upon the case as it stands.

Canon Blakesley, the "Hertfordshire Incumbent," is to be the new Dean of Lincoln, and Professor Rawlinson succeeds to the canonry of Canterbury thus voided.

GERMANY AND THE POPE.—Every day the strife between German and Papal interests displays stronger symptoms of becoming internecine. Commenting on the speech made by the Pope to the German Literary Club, a semi-official Berlin organ says that it contains a hint for the Government in its future policy on ecclesiastical questions. The ecclesiastical party is denounced as distinctly anti-national, and its aim is somewhat hyperbolically stigmatised as being "to shatter the powerful German Empire to its base."

MEN AND THINGS IN AMERICA.

(*By a Cosmopolitan.*)

THE LIQUOR LAWS.

The Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, in dealing with the experience of a working man in Maine, need not have insinuated that my informant was an Irishman of a low type. To relieve the mind of Mr. [illegible]er, I may say that the honest workman whose opinions I quoted was born in England, and is a widely esteemed "local" brother of the Methodist Church, and a teetotaller. He has several brothers in England, who are zealous and popular Methodists. Such a man may have been mistaken, but he is incapable of intentional misrepresentation. His views must be taken for what they are worth. I carefully avoided endorsing them until "further advised." When I have been to Maine myself I will tell you what I think of the working of the Maine Law in its mother State.

Since I mentioned this subject before, I have, however, met an English clergyman who is also an abstainer, and he positively asserts that when he was in Portland in December last, the law was not then enforced. He saw plenty of drink openly sold, and he came across several instances of intoxication. There is doubtless great difficulty in compelling the observance of a Maine Law. When the law was passed in New York State, legislators used to adroitly "face both ways" by telling the Prohibition party that they were "in favour" of the law, while they conciliated the gin-spinners by a counter declaration that they were "opposed to its execution." It is to be feared that this is "how the old thing works" in too many States.

It may be interesting to your readers to know exactly what the Liquor Laws as at present in operation in Maine are. The following is the wording of the Acts prohibiting the sale of liquors:—

An Act to amend section twenty-six of chapter twenty-seven of the revised statutes, relating to town liquor agents.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Legislature assembled, as follows:—

Section twenty-six of chapter twenty-seven of the revised statutes is hereby amended by striking out the word "shall" in the second and fifth lines, and inserting the word "may" in its stead, so that said section as amended shall read as follows:—

Sect. 26.—The selectmen of any town and mayor and aldermen of any city may on the first Monday of May annually, or as soon thereafter as may be convenient, purchase such quantity of intoxicating liquors as may be necessary to be sold under the provisions of this chapter, and may appoint some suitable person as the agent of said town or city to sell the same at some convenient place within said town or city, to be used for medicinal, mechanical, and manufacturing purposes and no other; and such agent shall receive such compensation for his services, and in the sale of such liquors shall conform to such regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of law, as the board appointing him shall prescribe, and he shall hold his situation one year unless sooner removed by them or their successors in office. Vacancies occurring during the year are to be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made. No such agent shall have any interest in such liquors or in the profits of the sale thereof. Such agent may sell to such municipal officers intoxicating liquors, to be by said officers disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

(Approved Feb. 28, 1872.)

An Act relating to the duties of sheriffs and county attorneys.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Legislature assembled, as follows:

Sect. 1.—It shall be the duty of sheriffs to obey all such orders and directions relating to the enforcement and execution of the laws of the State, as they shall from time to time receive from the governor.

Sect. 2.—It shall be the duty of sheriffs and their deputies, diligently and faithfully to inquire into all violations of the laws of the State, within their respective counties, and to institute legal proceedings against violations or supposed violations of law, and particularly the laws against the illegal sale of intoxicating liquors, and the keeping of drinking-houses and tippling-shops, gambling houses or places, and houses of ill-fame, either by promptly entering a complaint before a magistrate competent to examine or try the offence charged, and execute such warrants as may be issued on such complaints, or by furnishing the county attorney, promptly and without delay, with the names of alleged offenders, and of the witnesses. For services under the provisions of this law, sheriffs and their deputies, acting under their directions, shall be entitled to the same per diem compensation as for attendance on the supreme judicial court, and the same fees for travel as for the service of warrants in criminal cases, together with such necessary incidental expenses as may be just and proper; bills for which shall be audited by the county commissioners, and paid from the county treasury.

Sect. 3.—County attorneys shall caused to be summoned promptly before the grand jury of their several counties, all witnesses whose names have been furnished them by any sheriff or his deputies, as provided in section two of this Act, and shall faithfully direct inquiries before that body into violations of law, and shall prosecute persons indicted, and secure the prompt sentence of such as shall be convicted.

Sect. 4.—Whenever the governor shall, after investigation, be satisfied that any sheriff or county attorney has wilfully refused or neglected to discharge the duties imposed on each by this Act, it shall be his duty to bring such fact to the attention of the Legislature at the earliest practical day.

(Approved Feb. 29, 1872.)

Now, as to the operation of the Acts, I find a singular confirmation of what the workman from Maine told me in the *New York Commercial Advertiser* of May 17, 1872:—

The thirsty souls in Maine resort to peculiar methods to gratify their love of the ardent. At Winterport, on Monday, eight flour-barrels were seized, each containing a twenty-gallon keg of whiskey.

From this it is evident that there is a regular and organised system of smuggling, and, if so, mere statistics as to the decreased duties paid on liquor may be totally deceptive, as illustrative of the actual consumption of drink in Maine.

Many and varied have been the experiments in liquor legislation in the United States. Recently a singular proposal was debated in a Western State—to the effect that drinkers, and not sellers, should be licensed. Every person who wanted to "imbibe" much or little was to be compelled to take out a license to drink. To get the said license he was to pay ten dollars, and produce two responsible sureties to guarantee that he would never take "a drop too much." What do you think of this idea?

The *New York World* describes another social experiment:—

The Wisconsin Legislature, which has just adjourned, distinguished its closing hours by the passage of an entirely unique law. Section four provides that "it shall be unlawful within this State for any person to become intoxicated." Drunkenness has heretofore been supposed only a misdemeanour when publicly manifested, but under this section a fellow who fuddles himself at his own table makes not only a beast but a criminal of himself. For the offence the punishment is to be imprisonment from one day to two months certain, with a further contingent imprisonment at the discretion of the court until the costs of his conviction are defrayed. Further still, any person found drunk may be taken in charge by any good Samaritan so disposed and held until such Samaritan judge him entirely sober, at which time the Samaritan's little bill for the expenses of his hospitality, together with a fee of two dollars *per diem*, must be paid.

Far more popular than the Maine Law is the Ohio Law. This is locally known as the "Adair Law," from the fact that it was proposed and carried in the Ohio Legislature by the Hon. Mr. Adair. It is provided as follows by this Act:—

Sect. 7.—That every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer, or other person who shall be injured in person or property, or means of support, by any intoxicated person, or in consequence of the intoxication, habitual or otherwise, of any person, such wife, child, parent, guardian, employer, or other person, shall have a right of action in his or her own name, severally or jointly, against any person or persons who shall, by selling or giving intoxicating liquors, have caused the intoxication, in whole or in part, of such person or persons, and the owner of, lessee, or persons renting or leasing any building or premises, having knowledge that intoxicating liquors are to be sold therein in violation of law, or having leased the same for other purposes, shall knowingly permit intoxicating liquors to be so sold in such building or premises that have caused the intoxication, in whole or in part, of such person or persons, shall be liable severally or jointly with the person or persons selling or giving intoxicating liquors aforesaid, for all damages sustained, as well as exemplary damages; and a married woman shall have the same right to bring suits, and control the same, and the amount recovered, the same as if a *feme sole*. And all damages recovered by a minor under this Act shall be paid either to such minor, or to his or her parent, guardian, or next friend, as the court shall direct; and the unlawful sale or giving away of intoxicating liquors shall work a forfeiture of all rights of the lessee or tenant, under any lease or contract of rent upon premises where such unlawful sale or giving away shall take place; and all suits for damage under this Act shall be by a civil action in any of the courts of this State having jurisdiction thereof.

Sect. 10.—For all fines, costs, and damages assessed against any person or persons in consequence of the sale of intoxicating liquors, as provided in section seven of this Act, and the Act to which this is amendatory, the real estate and personal property of such person or persons, of every kind, without exception or exemption, under the Act to amend an Act entitled an Act to regulate judgment and executions at law, passed March 1st, 1831, passed March 9th, 1840, took effect March 15th, 1840 (S and C 1143), shall be liable for the payment thereof; and such fines, costs, and damages shall be a lien upon such real estate until paid, and in case any person or persons shall rent or lease to another or others any building or premises to be used or occupied, in whole or in part, for the sale of intoxicating liquors, or shall permit the same to be so used or occupied, in whole or in part, such building or premises so leased, used or occupied, shall be held liable for, and may be sold to pay all fines, costs, and damages assessed against any person or persons occupying such building or premises; and proceedings may be had to subject the same to the payment of any such fine and costs assessed or judgment recovered which remain unpaid, or any part thereof, either before or after execution, shall issue against the property of the person or persons against whom such fine and costs or judgment shall have been adjudged or assessed; and when execution shall issue against the property so leased or rented, the officer shall proceed to satisfy said execution out of the building or premises so leased or occupied as aforesaid; and in case such building or premises belong to a minor, insane person, or idiot, the guardian of such minor, insane person, or idiot, who has control of such building or premises, shall be liable and account to his or her ward for all damages on account of such use and occupation of such building or premises, and the liabilities for the fines, costs, and damages aforesaid; and all contracts whereby any building or premises shall be rented or leased, and the same shall be used or occupied, in whole or in part, for the sale of intoxicating liquors,

shall be void, and the (lessee) person or persons renting or leasing said building or premises, shall, on and after the selling or giving intoxicating liquors as aforesaid, be considered and held to be in possession of said building or premises.

There is a great diversity of opinion among temperance men as to the success or failure of Neal Dow's Act, but there is a singular unanimity with regard to the Ohio Law. The Adair Act is universally admitted to be entirely successful. In a letter received from the Governor of Ohio, his excellency says :—

The law meets with much favour among the friends of temperance, and although it does not amount to prohibition, it is nevertheless doing much to alleviate the suffering and misery caused by intemperance.

After twenty years of agitation it seems to be universally conceded that the Maine Law cannot be carried in England ; and however such a law may be desirable in the eyes of temperance reformers, it would probably be the wisest policy for them to consider how far some of the less prohibitive measures which are in operation in the United States would be likely to succeed. So far as I can ascertain, the Ohio Law is the best and most successful Liquor Law ever enacted.

The result of temperance politics in America is very peculiar. The *New York Herald* says :—"If a man wants to be elected to a small office, he must be a total abstinence man, particularly in New England. If he wants a big office, his temperance is an obstruction, for there is the German vote to be considered." Lager beer plays an important part in elections, and the Teutonic American fights as zealously for his "German beer" as Sir Wilfrid Lawson does for the Permissive Bill. Let me give you an instance of this. I was living in a partly German community where some teetotalers proposed to establish a "Good Templars'" lodge. Thereupon the Germans decided to have a "Lager Beer Society." I once heard a German professor in a northern university seriously declare that "good honest lager beer" would ultimately make all Americans healthy, wealthy, and wise. What chance has Neal Dow with men like this ?

In New York State a sort of Permissive Bill was lately passed, and the probabilities are that there will be local prohibition in many of the villages. In the large cities there is not the remotest possibility of any prohibitive action. On the whole, I think it would be easier to enforce prohibition in London than in New York City. The Americans proudly boast that they are "a law-abiding people," but as a matter of fact they are only partially so. Every citizen is fully conscious that *he* makes the laws, and that he is a being quite superior to his own manufacture. Hence all manner of good laws are violated daily, and it is nobody's business to correct the evil. Against liquor laws are ranged all the vested rights of the drink-traffickers, all the recklessness of the "fast" world, all the "freedom and independence" of Irish, German, and other foreign citizens. There is nothing here of the mysterious awe with which Englishmen regard what they vaguely call "the law." Under these circumstances the general success of the Maine Law can scarcely be predicted.

I have stated facts, and facts cannot be got over as some people think by abusing the person who records them. The nett result of my experience of American liquor laws is that total abstinence must be taught successfully before prohibition can be practised. Teetotalism must be the personal virtue of every citizen before prohibition can be the policy of any nation.

WORKING MEN'S CLUBS.—Sir W. Stephenson, Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, has acted upon the suggestion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the regulation of working men's clubs. In future, should clubs selling excisable liquors deposit a copy of their rules with the board, and adhere to them if approved by that body, those institutions will be quite secure from prosecution.

THE POET COWPER.—A stained-glass window has just been placed in the chancel of the Berkhampstead parish church, to the memory of the poet Cowper, who was born in Berkhampstead, and whose father and mother were buried in the chancel. The memorial cost about 300*l.*, which has been raised by public subscriptions, chiefly through the exertions of Mr. W. Longman, Earl Brownlow, and the rector, the Rev. J. W. Cobb. The subject of the window is the Resurrection, beneath the central figure being the poet, with hands clasped on an open Bible. On one side of poet is the Royal Psalmist, and on the other the Prophet Jeremiah. Cowper's tame hares are also included in the representation. The inscription is as follows :—"William Cowper, the poet, son of John Cowper, D.D., rector of this parish, and Ann, his wife. Born at Berkhampstead, November 15th, 1731 ; died April 25th, 1800." The work was executed by Messrs. Clayton and Bell, of London.

Imperial Parliament.

(*Continued from page 69*)

Mr. A. ILLINGWORTH : Sir, in rising to say a few words in support of the original resolution before the House, I would begin by remarking that it is admitted on all hands that the National Church of this country is under the control of the State. ("No, no.") That at any rate has been the assumption to-night, and it has been generally held that this Parliament is supreme in everything connected with the Church, so far as the management of its property is concerned, and the arrangement of its ritual, its dogmas, and doctrines ; with respect to all these matters this House must be appealed to. I need only refer to the numerous ecclesiastical bills which are continually coming up in this and the other House of Parliament to prove that a great obligation is thrown upon our Legislature in dealing with the State-Church and her interests. I wish, before proceeding further, to answer a question put by the hon. member for Frome, as to whether it would be prudent to allow an organisation immensely rich—in possession of revenues, as he says, of over ten millions a year—to become free from State control. Now, sir, this House has a great respect for precedent, and my hon. friend must surely have forgotten the precedent established in the case of the Irish Church. Does anybody suppose that the disestablished Episcopal Church in Ireland is a danger to the State in its new position ? I venture to tell my hon. friend that that Church is relatively richer to-day than the Church of England would be if disestablished to-day. I would wish to point out to him another consideration—viz., that a Church is not powerful, is not influential in proportion to its wealth, but almost in spite of pecuniary power. (Hear, hear.) If it has thorough confidence in the justness of its own position, and in the truthfulness of its foundation, in that way, and by that means it will make headway in the world. Wealth, sir, in itself is rather an encumbrance to a religious institution than an advantage. I would ask my hon. friend to look at the very first century of the Christian era. Was the Church in possession of wealth, then ? Yet when was it so powerful ? Where is the authority for supposing that the English Church without these immense revenues would not be capable of doing much more work, and better, than at the present time ? Now, sir, reference has been made to the parochial system in this country, and my hon. friend has stated that without the Established Church it would be impossible to provide for the religious wants of the people, but so far as the large towns are concerned, my hon. friend must admit the parochial system has utterly broken down. ("No, no," and cheers.) Take any town that has a church or churches beyond the parish church, and I ask how have these new churches been established ? In this House there are many gentlemen of whom it may be said that they themselves have built and endowed churches. The hon. member for the West Riding, the hon. member for Halifax, and the member for Oxford University, whom I might also claim as a Yorkshireman, have by their action in this direction shown the utter unfitness and inefficiency of the parochial system. They have themselves adopted the voluntary system in subscribing money out of their own pockets in building and endowing these churches. We are told the Church Establishment must rest its case upon the agricultural districts. Now, in the face of facts which may be easily adduced, I think it is dangerous to rest the case of the Established Church upon this narrow ground. I might illustrate my position for a moment by referring to the case of Wales. My hon. friend the member for Merthyr Tydvil has stated facts again and again, showing that the Principality of Wales is completely provided with places of worship—provided as fully as any other part of the United Kingdom ; and that those places have been provided by the voluntary principle. This no one will deny, and it is a most significant fact that it is out of the poverty of the Welsh people that this creation has come. But I need not confine myself to Wales, for that was even the case with Scotland. Will anyone say that at this moment the force and vitality of Christianity in Scotland is exhibited in the Church Establishment there ? There are, we know, national endowments in Scotland, but I assert fearlessly that the zeal and energy of modern Christianity in dealing with the religious wants of the Scotch people have come from the Dissenting branches of the Presbyterian body. I go further and ask the patience of the House whilst for a few moments I refer to America. We are told upon authority which cannot be questioned that so far as the places of worship are concerned, the United States are amply provided with sittings for all who are able to enter those places of worship, let them be what they may. I do say, then, it cannot be said with truth that the voluntary principle has failed either in this country or in the United States of America, where it has been fully tried. When my hon. friend refers to the Baptists and other Dissenting bodies, and asks whether they alone in their poverty have been able to meet the religious wants of this country, I reply at once, "No, they have not," nor is it to be expected that they should ; but to that reply I would add this, that if the Episcopalian body, which possesses nine-tenths of the religious wealth of the country, did anything like what the Dissenting bodies, in their poverty and in the face of all kinds of difficulties, have done, there would not be a hamlet in the country, however small it may be, where their Church would not be in active operation. (Cheers.) I deny that we want to destroy the Episcopalian Church. We are all in the eye of the law members of the Church of England, and I would venture to suggest to the professed members of that Church that they are altogether in error in supposing, or saying, that the Church belongs to any one portion of the community. (Hear, hear.) Besides being by law a member of the Church of England, I am a Dissenter. I am one of those Baptists to whom my hon. friend, the mover of the amendment, has referred. I may therefore claim to know something of the facts respecting that denomination. I wish at once to assert that to the Episcopal Church in the country I have not the slightest objection ; on the contrary, I would wish it unbounded success. My objection rests to the union of one branch of the Christian Church with the State of this country—to its enjoying public property, to its occupying unceasingly the time of this House—(Hear, hear)—to its inability to manage its own affairs. Of this the reformed House of Commons is no doubt more thoroughly representative of the people of this country than any former House has been, but will any one say it is a better body for the settlement of Church questions than the unreformed Houses were ? We do not see here to-night any of the representatives of the sister island. I do not wonder at their absenting themselves when these questions affecting the Church of England come up in this House. This should be an Imperial Legislature. (Cheers.) But we have been told over and over again in bygone debates, that it is a fitting thing for Dissenting and Roman Catholic members either to absent themselves from the House, or be silent, when questions come up affecting the State-Church. Nothing, however, will induce me to believe that it is not wrong for us thus to be engaged upon questions of this kind. These questions as to the relations of Church and State, sir, are only now coming to the front. Many of the changes which we in this country have been advocating, have been realized, and I believe at no very distant date the proper relations of the State to the Episcopal body of this country will occupy general attention. Let me for a moment give the House a quotation showing the opinion entertained by Dr. Döllinger as it appears in the *Guardian*, of February 28, in a report of the doctor's third lecture. He says, "And as regards the State Church itself in England, there must, if she will deal seriously with the attempts at union, first be accomplished a deeply based alteration in the situation of the Church. She must, as I think, lose her present position by which she is the ruling State Church, since, through this position, she is at once too narrow and broad, too loose and too confined, too free on the one side and too dependent on the other." (Hear, hear.) This, sir, is the opinion of a man who looks at this question from a different standpoint to our own, and his words are surely worthy of our consideration. I venture, sir, to urge that this motion is extremely appropriate as regards the time when my hon. friend the member for Bradford brings it forward, and so far as the debate has gone there seems to be no real difference as to the desirableness of granting that for which he asks. If there be in the possession of the National Church a revenue of something like ten millions, as it is admitted there is, it is nothing but right as a matter of practical common sense that it should be brought under the purview of the Legislature. There are no funds of a like character in which there has been so much jobbery, in the distribution of which there has been so much inequality, and in the use of which so much unfairness as these ; and I venture, sir, to think the people of this country will insist upon a searching inquiry, not only into the revenues of the Church, but into the manner in which they are dispensed. (Cheers.)

Mr. CUBITT said it had been assumed by the hon. member for Bradford that the motion standing in his name was intended as a joke, but he had far too great a regard for the dignity of the House to think of treating its votes as the medium for making a joke. (Hear, hear.) He hoped, besides, he had too deep a sense of the gravity of this subject to attempt to make a practical joke with reference to it. This, however, was not the first time he had heard the idea of a joke attributed to his motion. That idea originated in the columns of the *Nonconformist* newspaper, being accompanied by a statement that if the motion were not a joke the Dissenters were prepared to show that they would enter with clean hands into the inquiry. At all events, he did not think they would enter into it with empty hands. (Hear, hear.) Without discussing the general question at so late an hour, he wished to say he should oppose both the motion and the amendment, on the ground that the inquiry asked for by the hon. members opposite would be only a partial one. (Hear, hear.) It was impossible that religious bodies should exist for a number of years in a country like this without accumulating property, and it was equally impossible that that property should not come in some degree under the direction and the protection of the State. To begin with, the Roman Catholics possessed a great deal of pro-

although success has been achieved in spite of their vaticinations, and as the result of the very policy which they satirised, they are hardly ingenuous enough to confess their error and to pay a tribute to the Minister whose supposed shortcomings have proved to be one of the finest examples of executive capacity. The more necessary is it therefore that those who are able to appreciate the service which Lord Granville has rendered to his country and to mankind should give him the praise to which he is fairly entitled, and acknowledge that, since the late Prince Consort took upon himself the responsibility of urging the Queen to require the modification of the Trent despatches, there has not been an occasion on which the adviser of the Crown has shown so much wisdom or self-restraint in the management of a complicated and difficult negotiation. In saying this, we are most anxious not to ignore the fact that Mr. Disraeli—unlike some of the less disciplined of his followers—has loyally preferred the well-being of the country to the selfish interests of a party, and that in taking a course so worthy of his position he has done justice to the historic side of his character.

Lord Granville's special merit is that when failure appeared to be most imminent, he refused to recognise its possibility; that he gave the American nation an opportunity of withdrawing the indirect claims without injury to their public spirit; and that when, owing to verbal disagreements, the Supplementary Article could not be concluded in time, he kept the Geneva Tribunal alive by proposing an adjournment of its sittings, and by insisting that its functions were not regulated by mere technical considerations. In what spirit the Tribunal itself met these persevering efforts of a wise diplomacy to prevent the collapse of the arbitration, Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone have already explained to an applauding Parliament. Nothing could better illustrate the real vitality which exists in a properly-constituted Court of arbitration than the determination of the Arbitrators themselves that they would assist the two Governments to a mutual understanding on the only points of difference which existed between them; and if it be true—as we have every reason to believe it is—that Mr. Adams himself was most emphatic in his advocacy of the withdrawal of the indirect claims from the purview of the Court, we have a right to claim for the Americans a large share of that credit which, as we have before remarked, is due to Lord Granville's moderation and good sense.

The Court took the sensible view that the proposed adjournment would be unproductive of any useful result, and might, if the two Governments failed to arrive at an agreement, render the whole arbitration abortive:—"This being "so, the arbitrators think it right to state, after "the most careful perusal of all that has been "urged on the part of the Government of the "United States in respect of these claims, they "have arrived, individually and collectively, at "the conclusion that these claims do not con"stitute, upon the principles of international "law applicable to such cases, good foundation "for an award of compensation or computation "of damages between nations, and should upon "such principles be wholly excluded from the "consideration of the tribunal in making its "award, if there were no disagreement between "the two Governments as to the competency of "the tribunal to decide thereon." After such a declaration, the Washington Cabinet—which had already surrendered the principle of the indirect claims—could no longer hold out upon points of form. The Sumnerian doctrine of consequential damages was dead: it only remained to celebrate its obsequies. These have taken place; the American agent has himself filled up the grave which the Arbitrators had dug; and we may now say with the clown in *Hamlet*, that "the houses that the grave-digger "makes last till doomsday." The arbitration, shorn of all complexities and hidden perils, will at once proceed; and there is reason to hope that, within a period of two months, we shall have the judgment of the Court upon the case as it stands.

Canon Blakesley, the "Hertfordshire Incumbent," is to be the new Dean of Lincoln, and Professor Rawlinson succeeds to the canonry of Canterbury thus voided.

GERMANY AND THE POPE.—Every day the strife between German and Papal interests displays stronger symptoms of becoming internecine. Commenting on the speech made by the Pope to the German Literary Club, a semi-official Berlin organ says that it contains a hint for the Government in its future policy on ecclesiastical questions. The ecclesiastical party is denounced as distinctly anti-national, and its aim is somewhat hyperbolically stigmatised as being "to shatter the powerful German Empire to its base."

MEN AND THINGS IN AMERICA.

(*By a Cosmopolitan.*)

THE LIQUOR LAWS.

The Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, in dealing with the experience of a working man in Maine, need not have insinuated that my informant was an Irishman of a low type. To relieve the mind of Mr. Barker, I may say that the honest workman whose opinions I quoted was born in England, and is a widely esteemed "local" brother of the Methodist Church, and a teetotaller. He has several brothers in England, who are zealous and popular Methodists. Such a man may have been mistaken, but he is incapable of intentional misrepresentation. His views must be taken for what they are worth. I carefully avoided endorsing them until "further advised." When I have been to Maine myself I will tell you what I think of the working of the Maine Law in its mother State.

Since I mentioned this subject before, I have, however, met an English clergyman who is also an abstainer, and he positively asserts that when he was in Portland in December last, the law was not then enforced. He saw plenty of drink openly sold, and he came across several instances of intoxication. There is doubtless great difficulty in compelling the observance of a Maine Law. When the law was passed in New York State, legislators used to adroitly "face both ways" by telling the Prohibition party that they were "in favour" of the law, while they conciliated the gin-spinners by a counter declaration that they were "opposed to its execution." It is to be feared that this is "how the old thing works" in too many States.

It may be interesting to your readers to know exactly what the Liquor Laws as at present in operation in Maine are. The following is the wording of the Acts prohibiting the sale of liquors:—

An Act to amend section twenty-six of chapter twenty-seven of the revised statutes, relating to town liquor agents.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Legislature assembled, as follows:—

Section twenty-six of chapter twenty-seven of the revised statutes is hereby amended by striking out the word "shall" in the second and fifth lines, and inserting the word "may" in its stead, so that said section as amended shall read as follows:—

Sect. 26.—The selectmen of any town and mayor and aldermen of any city may on the first Monday of May annually, or as soon thereafter as may be convenient, purchase such quantity of intoxicating liquors as may be necessary to be sold under the provisions of this chapter, and may appoint some suitable person as the agent of said town or city to sell the same at some convenient place within said town or city, to be used for medicinal, mechanical, and manufacturing purposes and no other; and such agent shall receive such compensation for his services, and in the sale of such liquors shall conform to such regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of law, as the board appointing him shall prescribe, and he shall hold his situation one year unless sooner removed by them or their successors in office. Vacancies occurring during the year are to be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made. No such agent shall have any interest in such liquors or in the profits of the sale thereof. Such agent may sell to such municipal officers intoxicating liquors, to be by said officers disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

(Approved Feb. 28, 1872.)

An Act relating to the duties of sheriffs and county attorneys.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Legislature assembled, as follows:

Sect. 1.—It shall be the duty of sheriffs to obey all such orders and directions relating to the enforcement and execution of the laws of the State, as they shall from time to time receive from the governor.

Sect. 2.—It shall be the duty of sheriffs and their deputies, diligently and faithfully to inquire into all violations of the laws of the State, within their respective counties, and to institute legal proceedings against violations or supposed violations of law, and particularly the laws against the illegal sale of intoxicating liquors, and the keeping of drinking houses and tippling-shops, gambling houses or places, and houses of ill-fame, either by promptly entering a complaint before a magistrate competent to examine or try the offence charged, and execute such warrants as may be issued on such complaints, or by furnishing the county attorney, promptly and without delay, with the names of alleged offenders, and of the witnesses. For services under the provisions of this law, sheriffs and their deputies, acting under their directions, shall be entitled to the same per diem compensation as for attendance on the supreme judicial court, and the same fees for travel as for the service of warrants in criminal cases, together with such necessary incidental expenses as may be just and proper; bills for which shall be audited by the county commissioners, and paid from the county treasury.

Sect. 3.—County attorneys shall caused to be summoned promptly before the grand jury of their several counties, all witnesses whose names have been furnished them by any sheriff or his deputies, as provided in section two of this Act, and shall faithfully direct inquiries before that body into violations of law, and shall prosecute persons indicted, and secure the prompt sentence of such as shall be convicted.

Sect. 4.—Whenever the governor shall, after investigation, be satisfied that any sheriff or county attorney has wilfully refused or neglected to discharge the duties imposed on each by this Act, it shall be his duty to bring such fact to the attention of the Legislature at the earliest practical day.

(Approved Feb. 29, 1872.)

Now, as to the operation of the Acts, I find a singular confirmation of what the workman from Maine told me in the *New York Commercial Advertiser* of May 17, 1872:—

The thirsty souls in Maine resort to peculiar methods to gratify their love of the ardent. At Winterport, on Monday, eight flour-barrels were seized, each containing a twenty-gallon keg of whiskey.

From this it is evident that there is a regular and organised system of smuggling, and, if so, mere statistics as to the decreased duties paid on liquor may be totally deceptive, as illustrative of the actual consumption of drink in Maine.

Many and varied have been the experiments in liquor legislation in the United States. Recently a singular proposal was debated in a Western State—to the effect that drinkers, and not sellers, should be licensed. Every person who wanted to "imbibe" much or little was to be compelled to take out a license to drink. To get the said license he was to pay ten dollars, and produce two responsible sureties to guarantee that he would never take "a drop too much." What do you think of this idea?

The *New York World* describes another social experiment:—

The Wisconsin Legislature, which has just adjourned, distinguished its closing hours by the passage of an entirely unique law. Section four provides that "it shall be unlawful within this State for any person to become intoxicated." Drunkenness has heretofore been supposed only a misdemeanour when publicly manifested, but under this section a fellow who fuddles himself at his own table makes not only a beast but a criminal of himself. For the offence the punishment is to be imprisonment from one day to two months certain, with a further contingent imprisonment at the discretion of the court until the costs of his conviction are defrayed. Further still, any person found drunk may be taken in charge by any good Samaritan so disposed and held until such Samaritan judge him entirely sober, at which time the Samaritan's little bill for the expenses of his hospitality, together with a fee of two dollars *per diem*, must be paid.

Far more popular than the Maine Law is the Ohio Law. This is locally known as the "Adair Law," from the fact that it was proposed and carried in the Ohio Legislature by the Hon. Mr. Adair. It is provided as follows by this Act:—

Sect. 7.—That every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer, or other person who shall be injured in person or property, or means of support, by any intoxicated person, or in consequence of the intoxication, habitual or otherwise, of any person, such wife, child, parent, guardian, employer, or other person, shall have a right of action in his or her own name, severally or jointly, against any person or persons who shall, by selling or giving intoxicating liquors, have caused the intoxication, in whole or in part, of such person or persons, and the owner of, lessee, or persons renting or leasing any building or premises, having knowledge that intoxicating liquors are to be sold therein in violation of law, or having leased the same for other purposes, shall knowingly permit intoxicating liquors to be so sold in such building or premises that have caused the intoxication, in whole or in part, of such person or persons, shall be liable severally or jointly with the person or persons selling or giving intoxicating liquors aforesaid, for all damages sustained, as well as exemplary damages; and a married woman shall have the same right to bring suits, and control the same, and the amount recovered, the same as if a *feme sole*. And all damages recovered by a minor under this Act shall be paid either to such minor, or to his or her parent, guardian, or next friend, as the court shall direct; and the unlawful sale or giving away of intoxicating liquors shall work a forfeiture of all rights of the lessee or tenant, under any lease or contract of rent upon premises where such unlawful sale or giving away shall take place; and all suits for damage under this Act shall be by a civil action in any of the courts of this State having jurisdiction thereof.

Sect. 10.—For all fines, costs, and damages assessed against any person or persons in consequence of the sale of intoxicating liquors, as provided in section seven of this Act, and the Act to which this is amendatory, the real estate and personal property of such person or persons, of every kind, without exception or exemption, under the Act to amend an Act entitled an Act to regulate judgment and executions at law, passed March 1st, 1831, passed March 9th, 1840, took effect March 15th, 1840 (S and C 1143), shall be liable for the payment thereof; and such fines, costs, and damages shall be a lien upon such real estate until paid, and in case any person or persons shall rent or lease to another or others any building or premises to be used or occupied, in whole or in part, for the sale of intoxicating liquors, or shall permit the same to be so used or occupied, in whole or in part, such building or premises so leased, used or occupied, shall be held liable for, and may be sold to pay all fines, costs, and damages assessed against any person or persons occupying such building or premises; and proceedings may be had to subject the same to the payment of any such fine and costs assessed or judgment recovered which remain unpaid, or any part thereof, either before or after execution, shall issue against the property of the person or persons against whom such fine and costs or judgment shall have been adjudged or assessed; and when execution shall issue against the property so leased or rented, the officer shall proceed to satisfy said execution out of the building or premises so leased or occupied as aforesaid; and in case such building or premises belong to a minor, insane person, or idiot, the guardian of such minor, insane person, or idiot, who has control of such building or premises, shall be liable and account to his or her ward for all damages on account of such use and occupation of such building or premises, and the liabilities for the fines, costs, and damages aforesaid; and all contracts whereby any building or premises shall be rented or leased, and the same shall be used or occupied, in whole or in part, for the sale of intoxicating liquors,

shall be void, and the (lessee) person or persons renting or leasing said building or premises, shall, on and after the selling or giving intoxicating liquors as aforesaid, be considered and held to be in possession of said building or premises.

There is a great diversity of opinion among temperance men as to the success or failure of Neal Dow's Act, but there is a singular unanimity with regard to the Ohio Law. The Adair Act is universally admitted to be entirely successful. In a letter received from the Governor of Ohio, his excellency says :—

The law meets with much favour among the friends of temperance, and although it does not amount to prohibition, it is nevertheless doing much to alleviate the suffering and misery caused by intemperance.

After twenty years of agitation it seems to be universally conceded that the Maine Law cannot be carried in England ; and however such a law may be desirable in the eyes of temperance reformers, it would probably be the wisest policy for them to consider how far some of the less prohibitive measures which are in operation in the United States would be likely to succeed. So far as I can ascertain, the Ohio Law is the best and most successful Liquor Law ever enacted.

The result of temperance politics in America is very peculiar. The *New York Herald* says :—"If a man wants to be elected to a small office, he must be a total abstinence man, particularly in New England. If he wants a big office, his temperance is an obstruction, for there is the German vote to be considered." Lager beer plays an important part in elections, and the Teutonic American fights as zealously for his "German beer" as Sir Wilfrid Lawson does for the Permissive Bill. Let me give you an instance of this. I was living in a partly German community where some teetotalers proposed to establish a "Good Templars'" lodge. Thereupon the Germans decided to have a "Lager Beer Society." I once heard a German professor in a northern university seriously declare that "good honest lager beer" would ultimately make all Americans healthy, wealthy, and wise. What chance has Neal Dow with men like this ?

In New York State a sort of Permissive Bill was lately passed, and the probabilities are that there will be local prohibition in many of the villages. In the large cities there is not the remotest possibility of any prohibitive action. On the whole, I think it would be easier to enforce prohibition in London than in New York City. The Americans proudly boast that they are "a law-abiding people," but as a matter of fact they are only partially so. Every citizen is fully conscious that *he* makes the laws, and that he is a being quite superior to his own manufacture. Hence all manner of good laws are violated daily, and it is nobody's business to correct the evil. Against liquor laws are ranged all the vested rights of the drink-traffickers, all the recklessness of the "fast" world, all the "freedom and independence" of Irish, German, and other foreign citizens. There is nothing here of the mysterious awe with which Englishmen regard what they vaguely call "the law." Under these circumstances the general success of the Maine Law can scarcely be predicted.

I have stated facts, and facts cannot be got over as some people think by abusing the person who records them. The nett result of my experience of American liquor laws is that total abstinence must be taught successfully before prohibition can be pracitsed. Teetotalism must be the personal virtue of every citizen before prohibition can be the policy of any nation.

WORKING MEN'S CLUBS.—Sir W. Stephenson, Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, has acted upon the suggestion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the regulation of working men's clubs. In future, should clubs selling excisable liquors deposit a copy of their rules with the board, and adhere to them if approved by that body, those institutions will be quite secure from prosecution.

THE POET COWPER.—A stained-glass window has just been placed in the chancel of the Berkhampstead parish church, to the memory of the poet Cowper, who was born in Berkhampstead, and whose father and mother were buried in the chancel. The memorial cost about 300*l.*, which has been raised by public subscriptions, chiefly through the exertions of Mr. W. Longman, Earl Brownlow, and the rector, the Rev. J. W. Cobb. The subject of the window is the Resurrection, beneath the central figure being the poet, with hands clasped on an open Bible. On one side of poet is the Royal Psalmist, and on the other the Prophet Jeremiah. Cowper's tame hares are also included in the representation. The inscription is as follows :—"William Cowper, the poet, son of John Cowper, D.D., rector of this parish, and Ann, his wife. Born at Berkhampstead, November 15th, 1731 ; died April 25th, 1800." The work was executed by Messrs. Clayton and Bell, of London.

Imperial Parliament.

(*Continued from page* 691.)

Mr. A. ILLINGWORTH : Sir, in rising to say a few words in support of the original resolution before the House, I would begin by remarking that it is admitted on all hands that the National Church of this country is under the control of the State. ("No, no.") That at any rate has been the assumption to-night, and it has been generally held that this Parliament is supreme in everything connected with the Church, so far as the management of its property is concerned, and the arrangement of its ritual, its dogmas, and doctrines ; with respect to all these matters this House must be appealed to. I need only refer to the numerous ecclesiastical bills which are continually coming up in this and the other House of Parliament to prove that a great obligation is thrown upon our Legislature in dealing with the State-Church and her interests. I wish, before proceeding further, to answer a question put by the hon. member for Frome, as to whether it would be prudent to allow an organisation immensely rich—in possession of revenues, as he says, of over ten millions a year—to become free from State control. Now, sir, this House has a great respect for precedent, and my hon. friend must surely have forgotten the precedent established in the case of the Irish Church. Does anybody suppose that the disestablished Episcopal Church in Ireland is a danger to the State in its new position ? I venture to tell my hon. friend that that Church is relatively richer to-day than the Church of England would be if disestablished to-day. I would wish to point out to him another consideration—viz., that a Church is not powerful, is not influential in proportion to its wealth, but almost in spite of pecuniary power. (Hear, hear.) If it has thorough confidence in the justness of its own position, and in the truthfulness of its foundation, in that way, and by that means it will make headway in the world. Wealth, sir, in itself is rather an encumbrance to a religious institution than an advantage. I would ask my hon. friend to look at the very first century of the Christian era. Was the Church in possession of wealth, then ? Yet when was it so powerful ? Where is the authority for supposing that the English Church without these immense revenues would not be capable of doing much more work, and better, than at the present time ? Now, sir, reference has been made to the parochial system in this country, and my hon. friend has stated that without the Established Church it would be impossible to provide for the religious wants of the people, but so far as the large towns are concerned, my hon. friend must admit the parochial system has utterly broken down. ("No, no," and cheers.) Take any town that has a church or churches beyond the parish church, and I ask how have these new churches been established ? In this House there are many gentlemen of whom it may be said that they themselves have built and endowed churches. The hon. member for the West Riding, the hon. member for Halifax, and the member for Oxford University, whom I might also claim as a Yorkshireman, have by their action in this direction shown the utter unfitness and inefficiency of the parochial system. They have themselves adopted the voluntary system in subscribing money out of their own pockets in building and endowing these churches. We are told the Church Establishment must rest its case upon the agricultural districts. Now, in the face of facts which may be easily adduced, I think it is dangerous to rest the case of the Established Church upon this narrow ground. I might illustrate my position for a moment by referring to the case of Wales. My hon. friend the member for Merthyr Tydvil has stated facts again and again, showing that the Principality of Wales is completely provided with places of worship—provided as fully as any other part of the United Kingdom ; and that those places have been provided by the voluntary principle. This no one will deny, and it is a most significant fact that it is out of the poverty of the Welsh people that this creation has come. But I need not confine myself to Wales, for that was even the case with Scotland. Will anyone say that at this moment the force and vitality of Christianity in Scotland is exhibited in the Church Establishment there ? There are, we know, national endowments in Scotland, but I assert fearlessly that the zeal and energy of modern Christianity in dealing with the religious wants of the Scotch people have come from the Dissenting branches of the Presbyterian body. I go further and ask the patience of the House whilst for a few moments I refer to America. We are told upon authority which cannot be questioned that so far as the places of worship are concerned, the United States are amply provided with sittings for all who are able to enter those places of worship, let them be what they may. I do say, then, it cannot be said with truth that the voluntary principle has failed either in this country or in the United States of America, where it has been fully tried. When my hon. friend refers to the Baptists and other Dissenting bodies, and asks whether they alone in their poverty have been able to meet the religious wants of this country, I reply at once, "No, they have not," nor is it to be expected that they should ; but to that reply I will add this, that if the Episcopalian body, which possesses nine-tenths of the religious wealth of the country, did anything like what the Dissenting bodies, in their poverty and in the face of all kinds of difficulties, have done, there would not be a hamlet in the country, however small it may be, where their Church would not be in active operation. (Cheers.) I deny that we want to destroy the Episcopalian Church. We are all in the eye of the law members of the Church of England, and I would venture to suggest to the professed members of that Church that they are altogether in error in supposing, or saying, that the Church belongs to any one portion of the community. (Hear, hear.) Besides being by law a member of the Church of England, I am a Dissenter. I am one of those Baptists to whom my hon. friend, the mover of the amendment, has referred. I may therefore claim to know something of the facts respecting that denomination. I wish at once to assert that to the Episcopal Church in the country I have not the slightest objection ; on the contrary, I would wish it unbounded success. My objection rests to the union of one branch of the Christian Church with the State of this country—to its enjoying public property, to its occupying unceasingly the time of this House—(Hear, hear)—to its inability to manage its own affairs. Of this the reformed House of Commons is no doubt more thoroughly representative of the people of this country than any former House has been, but will any one say it is a better body for the settlement of Church questions than the unreformed Houses were ? We do not see here to-night any of the representatives of the sister island. I do not wonder at their absenting themselves when these questions affecting the Church of England come up in this House. This should be an Imperial Legislature. (Cheers.) But we have been told over and over again in bygone debates, that it is a fitting thing for Dissenting and Roman Catholic members either to absent themselves from the House, or be silent, when questions come up affecting the State-Church. Nothing, however, will induce me to believe that it is not wrong for us thus to be engaged upon questions of this kind. These questions as to the relations of Church and State, sir, are only now coming to the front. Many of the changes which we in this country have been advocating, have been realised, and I believe at no very distant date the proper relations of the State to the Episcopal body of this country will occupy general attention. Let me for a moment give the House a quotation showing the opinion entertained by Dr. Döllinger as it appears in the *Guardian*, of February 28, in a report of the doctor's third lecture. He says, "And as regards the State Church itself in England, there must, if she will deal seriously with the attempts at union, first be accomplished a deeply based alteration in the situation of the Church. She must, as I think, lose her present position by which she is the ruling State Church, since, through this position, she is at once too narrow and broad, too loose and too confined, too free on the one side and too dependent on the other." (Hear, hear.) This, sir, is the opinion of a man who looks at this question from a different standpoint to our own, and his words are surely worthy of our consideration. I venture, sir, to urge that this motion is extremely appropriate as regards the time when my hon. friend the member for Bradford brings it forward, and so far as the debate has gone there seems to be no real difference as to the desirableness of granting that for which he asks. If there be in the possession of the National Church a revenue of something like ten millions, as it is admitted there is, it is nothing but right as a matter of practical common sense that it should be brought under the purview of the Legislature. There are no funds of a like character in which there has been so much jobbery, in the distribution of which there has been so much inequality, and in the use of which so much unfairness as these ; and I venture, sir, to think the people of this country will insist upon a searching inquiry, not only into the revenues of the Church, but into the manner in which they are dispensed. (Cheers.)

Mr. CUBITT said it had been assumed by the hon. member for Bradford that the motion standing in his name was intended as a joke, but he had far too great a regard for the dignity of the House to think of treating its votes as the medium for making a joke. (Hear, hear.) He hoped, besides, he had too deep a sense of the gravity of this subject to attempt to make a practical joke with reference to it. This, however, was not the first time he had heard the idea of a joke attributed to his motion. That idea originated in the columns of the *Nonconformist* newspaper, being accompanied by a statement that if the motion were not a joke the Dissenters were prepared to show that they would enter with clean hands into the inquiry. At all events, he did not think they would enter into it with empty hands. (Hear, hear.) Without discussing the general question at so late an hour, he wished to say he should oppose both the motion and the amendment, on the ground that the inquiry asked for by the hon. members opposite would be only a partial one. (Hear, hear.) It was impossible that religious bodies should exist for a number of years in a country like this without accumulating property, and it was equally impossible that that property should not come in some degree under the direction and the protection of the State. To begin with, the Roman Catholics possessed a great deal of pro-

but as that subject had been so often under the notice of the House by the hon. for North Warwickshire, he would not dwell upon it. He might also say that the Wesleyans and the Quakers had never concealed the fact that they possessed considerable property. The Jews, again, were also in possession of considerable property—(laughter)—he meant for religious purposes. He wished, however, to confine his remarks chiefly to those religious bodies which used to be called "the three denominations," but which were sometimes now spoken of as "the Free Churches." The member for Bradford had made an admission to-night which went further than any he had made before. He divided Church property into two classes—the older and the more recent. Now, he was ready to place the property of the Nonconformist body in the latter category, although he contended that both classes of property ought to be protected by the State. In the "Congregational Year Book" for the present year, the Rev. J. Baldwin Brown said :—

Of all the curses with which a spiritual community can be visited the worst is property—that is, property to be laid up in treasuries and administered by authorities.

Again, the Rev. Dr. Rees, in a paper contributed to the same annual, expressed himself as follows :—

The excellent Lady Barham built seven small chapels at her own expense in the Gower district, but through her mistaken benevolence in endowing most of them they are to this day weak and dependent on those miserable crutches, and only now beginning to learn the healthy exercise of their own wings.

While on this point, he might quote a statement made by his hon. friend the member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) in a debate in that House some years ago on the Trustees of Charities Bill. His hon. friend said :—

They (the Dissenters) neither cared for nor wanted any endowments. It was a fact worthy of consideration that out of 25,000 places of worship that Dissenters had in Great Britain only 100 or 200—and those were of old standing—had received an endowment, and even these were from private benevolence. In more modern times the Dissenters did not endow their places of worship, but trusted to the voluntary principle.

He would now illustrate by a few examples the practice of modern Nonconformists with regard to endowments. Mr. Remington Mills, formerly a member of that House, built a Congregational church at Egham, and endowed it with 70*l.* a year in house property when he left the neighbourhood. In one of those houses the minister lived, while the other two were devoted to purposes connected with the church. The late Sir Francis Crossley was also, he believed, a strong supporter of endowments. On the 7th of June last his will was quoted in the *Times*, and it appeared that among the bequests was one of 1,000*l.* to the Congregational Pastors' Retiring Fund, which was an endowed society with a capital of 88,000*l.* Sir F. Crossley also left 1,000*l.* to Airedale College, Bradford, besides making certain provisions with respect to the endowment of the almshouses erected by him at Halifax, and for the completion of any unfulfilled arrangements in connection with the Crossley Orphan Home and School, the majority of the governors of which institution were chosen by pastors and deacons of certain Independent churches. Again, the chairman of the anniversary meeting at Cheshunt College in 1869 mentioned in his speech, in terms of commendation, the endeavour of the Calvinistic Methodist body to raise an endowment of 20,000*l.* for their college at Trevecca, and of the success of the Rev. Edward Matthews in raising 18,000*l.* of this sum; and the report said that this college would be for Wales "an inestimable and everlasting blessing." That speech was delivered by Mr. Henry Richard, whom he believed he might identify with the hon. member for Merthyr-Tydvil. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) Leaving this matter, he would next consider what information we possessed as to Nonconformist endowments. The reports of the Charity Commissioners showed that endowments connected with Dissenting places of worship existed in nearly every county; but it was a singular fact that the "Congregational Year Book," the "Baptist Hand Book," the "Presbyterian Almanack," and the "Unitarian Almanack," although they gave lists of these places of worship, made no mention whatever of any endowments. (Hear.) He would, however, give the House, from other sources, some particulars affecting well-known charities. In 1704 Lady Hewley left property to seven trustees for various Dissenting objects, and in the year 1842, after great litigation, the suit was decided in favour of the retention of these endowments by the orthodox Dissenters. According to the latest returns of the Charity Commissioners the rents and dividends received by the trustees amounted to 6,000*l.* or 7,000*l.* a year, in addition to which they had invested in stock upwards of 40,000*l.*, and 1,700*l.* recently in the London and Westminster Bank. As to another charity—Coward's Trust—he had only arrived at a knowledge of the facts by accident, but this charity would be interesting to the House from the fact that Dr. Isaac Watts was one of the executors, from which circumstance the date of the commencement of the charity was fixed at the early part of the eighteenth century. Various objects were specified in the original bequest, which concluded thus :—"And for such other charitable and useful purposes as they, or the major part of them, judge to be most conclusive to the interests of true religion among Protestant Dissenters." The trustees in the present day were Dr. Stoughton, the Rev. T. Binney, and two other gentlemen not ministers of religion. Their whole income in the year 1871 was 3,442*l.*, and of this they granted for the education of students 1,100*l.*, and for the building of chapels and paying off debts 1,305*l.* Here, therefore, were the funds of a charity appropriated to the building of chapels, which were constantly paraded as the great triumphs of the voluntary system. (Cheers.) He did not wish to weary the House with details, but he would refer any hon. members who might wish to follow up the subject to Davis's Charity, Hanson's Charity, Chamberlaine's, Hollis's, Wilton's, Creed's, and numerous other charities and funds of a similar nature. While the hon. member for Bradford had all the materials which he required ready to his hand, he himself had been compelled to prosecute an active search, like a miner in Australia digging for gold, sometimes finding a few grains and sometimes lighting on a considerable nugget. But he had reason to believe that the vein was by no means exhausted, and that he had only arrived at the beginning of it. (Cheers.) He wished to add a word on the subject of endowed colleges in the possession of the Nonconformist bodies. Dr. Allon, in a paper read by him on the subject of the amalgamation of colleges, said, "We possess 16 collegiate institutions, having 38 professors, 368 students, and an aggregate income of about 25,000*l.* a year." How much of this was derived from endowments he was unable to say, but there was some evidence that the proportion must be very considerable. Passing by the other colleges, he would direct attention to the case of New College, which might be regarded as a model institution. Dr. Pye-Smith, in laying the first stone of this college in 1850, said that it would unite three old colleges—Homerton, Torrington-square, and Highbury—of which the earliest was founded soon after the time of William III. He also stated that "the pious men of that day did not seem to think it necessary to ascertain that their sons had the qualification for the ministry, and it was not until the institutions now united were founded that the satisfactory evidence of conversion to God in encouraging any young man to devote himself to the ministry was thoroughly understood to be of imperative and absolute necessity." In the language of the present day, that would mean that "tests" were not at first in vogue, but afterwards were found to be necessary. (Laughter.) "The candidates were required to be members of some Congregational Church and sixteen years old, to be able to adduce testimony of one or more Congregational ministers and of the church with which he was in fellowship to his consistent piety, mental ability, and general fitness for ministerial work." After all these an application in writing was to be sent in, and the council were to decide whether they would admit the candidate to an interview. The House, doubtless, would concur with him that the tests thus imposed were much more strict than those in vogue in Oxford or Cambridge in what hon. members opposite would call their worst days. Cheers.) To the college at Cheshunt peculiar importance was attached because it professed to be an undenominational college. But Dr. Allon in his address at the opening of the new buildings, said :—

Any student, when his education is finished, is at perfect liberty to exercise his ministry in whatever section of the Church of Christ he may prefer. The fact that so many of its *alumni* now enter the Congregational ministry is owing solely to changes in Church parties and popular sympathies.

In other words, this undenominational college was gradually becoming absorbed by the Congregational body. (Hear, hear.) At this college the series of questions submitted to candidates for admission was exceedingly searching. One of these he might, perhaps, be permitted to read :—"What reason have you for believing that you have experienced a saving work of grace upon your heart, at what period of your life, and by what means do you consider the change to have taken place? (To be answered very fully.)" The next question was :—"Can you cordially subscribe the fifteen articles subjoined to these questions?" (Laughter.) In a case submitted to the hon. and learned member for Richmond and the present Vice-Chancellor Wickens, the President, Dr. Reynolds, says :—

These Articles, taken principally from the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, are skilfully interwoven with some of the more important clauses of the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and while they carefully preserve the evangelical fervour of the originals, they avoid some of their crudities and are studiously comprehensive in all matters affecting Church policy.

As to the protection which the law afforded to these endowments, he would merely observe that the courts of the country were freely employed in reference to them, and that not merely with reference to the property of the various Dissenting bodies, but on points connected with their peculiar doctrines, as to which the Nonconformists appeared to be as completely "under Egyptian bondage" as members of the Established Church were popularly supposed to be. (Laughter.) One of the cases which had come before the law courts many years ago, was that relating to the Hewley Charity, which gave rise to a vast amount of litigation, and which was the principal cause of the legislation which was subsequently effected on the subject of the property held by Dissenting bodies. Many hon. members would recollect the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act in 1844 by Sir Robert Peel, the first clause of which made lawful the tenure, and confirmed persons in possession of property appropriated to Dissenting purposes which were unlawful prior to passing of certain recited enabling acts, and enacted that all deeds and documents relating to them be construed as if such acts had been in force at the time of the foundation of such meeting-houses. Clause 2 enacted that "religious doctrines or opinions for the preaching or promotion of which the meeting-house may be held, is to be collected from twenty-five years' usage, when not expressly stated in the trust-deed." In Skeats's "History of the Free Churches," published in 1869, by Mr. A. Miall—(a laugh)—it was stated that "the act, so far as it limited inquiry into the right to property, was in harmony with previous laws, and so far as it was calculated to prevent litigation was in harmony with the best civil and religious interests of society." The Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, in his address on the principles of trust-deeds, said :—

Many of the most eminent of our ministers are preaching under trust-deeds containing statements of doctrine which nothing would induce them to utter from the pulpits.

(Laughter.) Again, of late years there had been passed the following acts protecting the property of Dissenting bodies: the 13th and 14th Vict., cap. 28, called Sir Morton Peto's Act, for rendering more simple and effectual the law by which societies for religious worship hold property, the 31st and 32nd Vict., facilitating the acquisition of sites for religious purposes, the 32nd and 33rd of Vict., cap. 26, enabling Dissenters to acquire burial-grounds, and the 33rd and 34th Vict., cap. 34, called the Charitable Funds Investment Act, enabling trustees for public and charitable purposes to invest the funds intrusted to them in real securities. Another instance of the interference of the legislature with property held by Dissenting bodies was furnished by the Charity Commission, which received three or four applications a week to frame new trusts for property so held. The preparing and carrying into effect of these new trusts involved a cost to the country of 10,000*l.* a year, which was paid out of the Consolidated Fund, and he thought that the people at large had a right to complain that such a large sum was annually abstracted from their pockets for the exclusive benefit of the Dissenters. (Hear.) He trusted that he had said sufficient to show that there were great endowments possessed by the Dissenters; that that property was to a certain extent protected by law, and that therefore the proposals of the hon. members for Bradford and Frome were open to the objection that they were partial and did not embrace the whole question. In the improbable event of either of those proposals being carried, he should take the sense of the House upon the resolution of which he had given notice, and he gave the hon. member for Bradford fair warning that such was the way in which his joke would end. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) The hon. member for Huddersfield, in seconding the motion, had stood forth as a political Dissenter. He begged to remind the hon. member that a century ago we had had political Churchmen in this country—men who had done a great deal of harm to the Church, and he wished to know whether it had never crossed the hon. member's mind that political Dissenters might do a great deal of harm to the free churches of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) The political Dissenters, by their attempts, might prevent the Church of England from giving her undivided attention to that internal work which she was now engaged upon, and they might succeed in capturing some of her outworks; but even if they were to succeed in overthrowing her altogether, he did not believe that the free churches of this country would be then in existence to enjoy their triumph over her, and their acts would remain to prove to students of history that as great mistakes had been committed by ecclesiastical bodies in the 19th century as had been committed in any of the previous centuries. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GLADSTONE: Although I do not doubt that the House is quite prepared to arrive at a decision upon the motion and the amendment upon it which is now before them, still I do not think it would be respectful to the hon. member for Bradford and those with whom he acts were the Government to give a silent vote upon this question. While fully admitting the ability with which this question has been brought forward, we must all have felt that there is a certain want of definite purpose and reality in the proposal to which we are asked to accede—(Hear, hear.)—and that not because we have not a sufficient subject of debate before us, but because we are labouring under the difficulty of having too much put before us at one time. The hon. member for Bradford, having on his hands the gigantic question of the disestablishment of the Established Church, has found it expedient not to simplify but to further complicate and enlarge his task by mixing up with the main question an inquiry which involved matters of fact which are entirely distinct from the question of principle he has already raised. The hon. member for Frome has, however, gone even further, and has asked us to extend this inquiry, and to undertake an even more complicated subject—that of the redistribution of the property of the Established Church. The hon. member for West Surrey has also just now asked us to still further extend this inquiry to the property possessed by other eccles-

astical bodies in the kingdom besides the Established Church, as if the original subject was not quite sufficient to occupy us for three or four hours on a summer evening in July. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) There is one argument against the motion of the hon. member for Bradford which its opponents appear to have overlooked, which is that if this commission is appointed we should get rid of the hon. member and his motion for several years to come while this inquiry was pending. ("Hear," and a laugh.) The hon. member has cast his net very widely. He proposes to inquire not only into the amount but the nature and origin of ecclesiastical property now appropriated to the use of the Establishment. I did not gather from his speech at what point in the chronology of the human race he proposes to commence this inquiry. Probably he would be satisfied with beginning at the time of Melchisedec. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) The hon. member, instead of going straight to the heart and root of the question of principle he has raised, proposes to involve us in a preliminary inquiry of which we cannot see the end. The Government are in no degree reconciled to the object of my hon. friend by this change which he has made. I confess that I don't see that any case—I mean any sufficient case—has been made out for any of the proposals which have been brought before us to-night. With respect to capitular property and the cathedral system of this country, I hardly think that my hon. friend the member for Huddersfield—who always addresses the House with great ability—can believe that the impartiality of his speech and its historical fairness were as conspicuous as the talent which he invariably brings to bear on any argument he puts forward. My hon. friend, in justice to many of the eminent persons connected with these establishments, ought really to have referred to the great and successful efforts made within the last ten or fifteen years by the deans and chapters of many cathedrals, and not least of the two in this metropolis, for the purpose of making them powerful, living centres of religious activity—efforts which have met with a response from the inhabitants of this capital which will be ever memorable in our annals. (Hear, hear.) With reference to the redistribution of the property of the Church, pray let it be recollected that that is a matter which thirty or thirty-five years ago occupied much of the attention of statesmen and of Parliament, and that much has been done to remove the greater anomalies which formerly struck the eye. The extremes of wealth in the high places of the Church have been retrenched—not to the extent, perhaps, which my hon. friends might desire, but still with the effect of greatly cutting down the emoluments of those who held some of the highest and most responsible positions. On the other hand, that which did amount to a scandal, the beggarly character of the stipends, I don't say enjoyed, but received by many of the most laborious of the clergy—(Hear)—has been in a very considerable degree mitigated, if not removed, by the application of a very large portion of that cathedral property to which my hon. friend in that part of his speech, I must say, so obscurely referred. It is all very well to talk of a further redistribution of the property of the Church of England—of its parochial property, which constitutes the great mass of the property that it possesses. But when we pass from general, brief, and superficial discussions of this kind to grapple with details, everyone knows that you are met by peculiarities of the system, the growth of many generations of men, in one point of view impeding you by the extraordinary closeness of the intermixture of social and proprietary interests connected with the arrangement of the property of the Church; and, on the other hand, exhibiting an intimate union between the Church of England and the families of this country such as I venture to tell my hon. frind whenever his question of disestablishment, instead of being a debating question, becomes a practical question, will offer to him and to those who are associated with him very serious and very difficult matters to deal with. (Cheers.) I don't think, in regard to an inquiry, that my hon. friend can suppose that there is any reason why any great machinery should be put in motion to elicit facts with the general character of which Parliament and the country are acquainted, and with the minute character of which there is no reason why we should seek an acquaintance, except, perhaps, with the view of resuming at a future and distant year his motion for disestablishment, if we should accede to his present proposal. But if this motion cannot be supported as a motion directed to the substantive aims and ends of inquiry, neither are we prepared to support it as a motion intended for the attainment of ulterior purposes. Sir, it is not at this time of the night that I shall endeavour to make a speech on the enormous—the almost unmeasured questions that are involved in the subject of the disestablishment of the Church of England. My hon. friend has referred to the challenge which he says he received from me when I endeavoured to point out to him that if he wished to procure the acceptance of the opinions that he holds by the Parliament and the country he must begin by making a progress which he never yet has achieved—by converting to those opinions the people of this country. He refers and he may refer with some justice to the general progress of opinion and of affairs on the Continent of Europe. There is no doubt that circumstances have occurred in connection with the organisation of the Church of Rome in particular which have given an impulse more or less in other countries to the cause which my hon. friend has in hand. I am very doubtful whether they may have had a similar effect in this country. (Hear, hear.) I am very doubtful whether they may not have produced a reaction in the minds of the people of this country, who rather shrink from the contemplation of what they have been witnessing as a whole abroad, and who may be supposed to attach an additional value to what they possess with all its drawbacks, owing to the experience through which they see other nations passing in matters of religion. At any rate, I do not think my hon. friend has reached a point at which he is entitled to present this question to the House of Commons as one to be debated in a practical sense and with a view to a practical decision. I almost feel—I hope he will not think me disrespectful to him in saying this—that we are called on to-night to discharge the functions of a debating society rather than the ordinary duties of the British Parliament. (Hear.) His object seems to be remote—so remote from the wishes of the people of England—(cheers)—the estimate which has been formed of the work which has to be done in order to bring about a different state of things appears to me, I confess, to be so inadequate that, notwithstanding the undoubted ability, earnestness, and sincerity of my hon. friend, and no one possesses more earnestness or sincerity than he does—notwithstanding those qualities, I cannot but feel that a theoretical aspect and character seems to be spread over this discussion, which deprives it of much of that interest and reality which we recognise when we are dealing with questions that have relation to results and are within our power and faculty of calculation. Therefore, even if the time were more convenient than it is, there could be no necessity for me to lead the House into a lengthened discussion on the great subject which my hon. friend has to-night more indistinctly indicated. I don't wish to be understood as altogether putting aside on the part of the Government proposals made by my hon. friend the member for Frome and others with regard to the reforms which may be found practicable in the distribution of the property of the Church. What I do think is, that we are not prepared to enter wholesale upon those reforms. It is idle to suppose that they can be dealt with unless Parliament is prepared to give to them much of its time and attention—much more of its time and attention than the other calls upon it are likely to permit of its bestowing. And I must say that even my hon. friend opposite who seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Frome must himself have been sensible, when he had made all the deductions and all the qualifications that he felt to be necessary with regard to the rights of property, with regard to the respect due to vested interests, with regard to the necessity or expediency of preserving prizes in the Church, that the field for action in the province which he marked out for himself was really much more narrow than he might at first have supposed. But whatever is to be said upon this subject should be said as distinct from the motion before us. The connection of the two matters can only lead to confusion. I look, therefore, for a moment to the motion of my hon. friend the member for Bradford as entirely apart from these propositions of internal reform, and, so looking at it, I am bound to say that while I can see no reason why we should enter upon this lengthened and elaborate inquiry into matters of fact when we are already possessed of abundant information for all practical purposes, we are still less disposed to give countenance to this motion if we are to consider the ulterior purposes which my hon. friend has alluded to. (Hear.) He has distinctly, and by a process perfectly legitimate from his point of view, given us to understand that he wishes to collect the facts, and to be in possession of them in the most complete and accurate form, in order that he may afterwards found upon them proposals of extended constitutional change. To these proposals we are not friendly; we are not prepared to give them a present welcome; we are not prepared to look upon them as proposals which can be taken up by the administration that now exists in any future year. That being so, we think it best that we should at once decline to take shelter under the modified character of the demand my hon. friend makes upon us for the moment; we will not look at it, though I must at once admit that no fundamental objection can be taken in principle to the inquiry when treated simply as an inquiry. It is fair to him as well as to the House that we should take into our view the purpose for which that inquiry is to be directed, and as that purpose is one which we are not prepared to entertain we must ask the House to join with us in voting against the motion.

On the announcement of the numbers, Mr. Miall and several Nenconformist members left the House amid ironical cheering from the Opposition.

On Mr. Hughes's amendment being put there was a general cry of "withdraw," but a member below the gangway insisted on a division.

The House then divided—

For the amendment	...	...	41
Against it	...	...	270
Majority	...	...	—229

Some formal business was then proceeded with, and the House adjourned at two o'clock.

MR. MIALL'S MOTION.—THE DIVISION.

The following members (96) supported Mr. Miall's motion:—

Adair, H. E.	Graham, W.	Phillips, H. N.
Anderson, G.	Grieve, J. J.	Plimsoll, S.
Armitstead, G.	Hadfield, G.	Potter, E.
Baines, E.	Harris, J. D.	Price, W. P.
Barry, A. H. S.	Herbert, A. E. W.	Rathbone, W.
Bazley, Sir T.	Hoare, Sir H. A.	Reed, C.
Bentall, E. H.	Holland, S.	Richard, H.
Blennerhassett, Sir R.	Holms, J.	Richards, E. M.
Brewer, Dr.	Howard, J.	Russell, Lord A.
Bright, J.	Illingworth, A.	Rylands, P.
Brogden, A.	Johnston, A.	Samuelson, H. B.
Brown, A. H.	Kensington, Lord	Sartoris, E. J.
Buckley, N.	Kinnaird, Hn. A. F.	Seely, C. (Lin.)
Callan, P.	Lawrence, Sir J. C.	Shaw, R.
Candlish, J.	Lawrence, W.	Sheridan, H. B.
Carnegie, Hon. C.	Lawson, Sir W.	Smyth, P. J.
Carter, R. M.	Lush, Dr.	Stepney, Sir J.
Chadwick, D.	Lusk, A.	Taylor, P. A.
Clifford, C. C.	Macfie, R. A.	Torrens, R. R.
Colman, J. J.	Mackintosh, E. W.	Trevelyan, G. O.
Cowen, Sir J.	M'Arthur, W.	Villiers, C. P.
Crawford, E. H. J.	M'Clure, T.	Wegueiin, T. M.
Davies, R.	Maguire, J. F.	Whalley, G. H.
Delahunty, J.	Marling, S. S.	White, J.
Digby, K. T.	Melly, G.	Williams, W.
Dilke, Sir C. W.	Miller, J.	Willyams, E. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.	Morgan, G. O.	Wingfield, Sir C.
Dixon, G.	Morley, S.	Young, A. W.
Fawcett, H.	Morrison, W.	
Fitzmaurice, Lord.	Mundella, A. J.	TELLERS.
Fothergill, R.	Muntz, P. H.	Mr. Miall.
Gilpin, C.	Palmer, J. H.	Mr. Leatham.
Gourley, E. T.	Parry, L. J.	

The following Liberal members (96) opposed the motion:—

Akroyd, E.	Egerton, Capt. F.	Lloyd, Sir T. D.
Amcotts, Col. W. C.	Enfield, Viscount	Locke, J.
Antrobus, Sir E.	FitzGerald, Ld. O. A.	Lorne, Marquis of
Ayrton, Rt. Hn. A.	Fitzwilliam, Hon. C.	Lowe, Rt. Hon. R.
Bass, A.	Foljambe, F. J. S.	Lyttelton, Hn. C. G.
Bonham-Carter, J.	Forster, Hn. W. E.	M'Lagan, P.
Bouverie, Rt. Hn. E.	Foster, W. H.	Martin, P. W.
Bowmont, Marquis	Fortescue, Hn. D. F.	Maxwell, W.
Bowring, E. A.	Fortescue, Hn. C. P.	Mitchell, T. A.
Brand, H. R.	Gladstone, W. E.	Monk, C. J.
Brassey, T.	Gladstone, W. H.	Nicholson, W.
Bristowe, S. B.	Goschen, Hon. G. J.	Palmer, Sir R.
Bruce, Lord C.	Gower, Hn. E. F. L.	Peel, A. W.
Bruce, H. A.	Greville, Hon. Capt.	Pim, J.
Buller, Sir E.	Grosvenor, Hon. R.	Portman, W. B.
Campbell, H.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Cardwell, Rt. Hn. E.	Gudest, M.	Stansfeld, Hon. J.
Carington, Capt.	Harcourt, V.	Stapleton, J.
Cavendish, Lord F.	Hardcastle, J. A.	Stuart, Col.
Cavendish, Lord G.	Headlam, T. E.	Talbot, Hon. C.
Coleridge, Sir J. D.	Henley, Lord	Tollemache, Hon. F.
Colthurst, Sir G.	Henry, M.	Tollemache, Maj. W.
Cowper-Temple, W.	Hibbert, J. T.	Torrens, W. T. M.
Cowper, Hn. H. F.	Hodgson, K. D.	West, H. W.
Crawford, R. W.	Hughes, T.	Whatman, J.
Dalrymple, Dr.	Hurst, R. H.	Whitbread, S.
Denison, C. B.	Jardine, R.	Whitwell, J.
Denman, Hon. G.	Jessel, Sir G.	Williamson, Sir H.
Dent, J. D.	Johnstone, Sir H.	
Dodson, J. G.	K.-Shuttleworth, U.	TELLERS.
Dowse, R.	Kingscote, Col.	Mr. Glyn.
Duff, M. E. Grant	Laslett, W.	Mr. Adam.
Edwards, H.	Lefevre, G. J.	

The following Liberal members (172) were absent from the division, but, as will be seen, 12 of them paired in favour:—

Acland, Sir T. D.	Fitzwilliam, H.	Onslow, G.
Agar-Ellis, Major	Fletcher, I.	O'Reilly-Dease, M.
Allen, W. S.	Fordyce, W. D.	O'Reilly, M. W.
Amory, J. H.	Forster, C.	Osborne, R. B.
Anstruther, Sir R.	Fowler, W.	Otway, A. J.
Aytoun, R. S.	French, Col.	Parker, C. S.
Backhouse, E.	Gavin, Major	Pease, J. W.
Bagwell, J.	Goldsmid, Sir F.	Peel, Sir R.
Baker, R. B. W.	Goldsmid, Julian	Pelham, Lord
Barclay, A. C.	Gray, Sir J.	Pender, J.
Bass, M. T.	Grey, Sir G.	Playfair, Dr.
Bassett, W.	Grosvenor, Capt.	Potter, T. B.
Baxter, W. E.	Grove, T. F.	Power, J. T.
Beaumont, Capt. F.	Hamilton, H.	Price, W. E.
Beaumont, W. B.	Hanmer, Sir J.	Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Beaumont, S. A.	Hartington, Marq of	Robertson, D.
Biddulph, M.	Haviland Burke, E.	Roden, W. S.
Blennerhassett, R.	Henderson, J.	Rothschild, Baron L.
Bolckow, H. W. F.	Herbert, H. A.	Rothschild, Baron M
Brady, J.	Heron, D. C.	Rothschild, N. M.
Bright, J.	Hodgkinson, G.	St. Aubyn, J.
Brinckman, Capt.	Horsman, E.	St. Lawrence, Visct.
Brocklehurst, W.	Hoskyns, C. W.	Salomons, Sir D.
Browne, G. E.	Howard, C.	Samuda, J. D'A.
Bryan, G. L.	Hughes, W. B.	Samuelson, B.
Bury, Visct.	Hutt, Sir W.	Saunderson, E. J.
Ball, Dr.	Jones, H.	Seely, C., jun.,
Cadogan, Hon. F. W.	King, P. J. L.	Seymour, A.
Cartwright, W. F.	K.-Hugessen, E. H.	Shaw, W.
Cave, T.	Lambert, N. G.	Sherlock, D.
Chambers, M.	Lancaster, J.	Sherriff, A. C.
Chambers, Sir T.	Lea, T.	Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Childers, H.	Leeman, G.	Smith, J. B.
Cholmeley, Capt.	Lewis, H.	Smith, T. E.
Cholmeley, Sir M.	Lewis, J. D.	Stacpoole, Capt.
Clay, J.	Lubbock, Sir J.	Stanley, W. O.
Cogan, Rt. Hn. W.	MacEvoy, E.	Stevenson, J. C.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.	Leith, J. F.	Stone, W. H.
Corrigan, Sir D.	M'Lean, J. R.	Storks, Sir H. K.
Dalglish, R.	M'Laren, D.	Strutt, Hn. H.
D'Arcy, M. P.	M'Mahon, P.	Synan, E. J.
Davie, Sir H.	Magniac, C.	Tite, Sir W.
Dease, E.	Maitland, Sir A.	Tomline, G.
De la Poer, E.	Martin, J.	Tracy, C. H.
Dickinson, S. S.	Matheson, A.	Trelawny, Sir J.
Dodds, J.	Merry, J.	Verney, Sir H.
Downing, M. C.	Milbank, F.	Vivian, H. H.
Duff, R. W.	Monsell, Hon. W.	Vivian, A. P.
Dundas, F.	Murphy, N. D.	Walter, J.
Ellice, E.	Nicol, J. D.	Wedderburn, Sir D.
Ennis, J. J.	O'Brien, Sir P.	Wells, W.
Erskine, Admiral	O'Conor Don.	Whitworth, T.
Esmonde, Sir J.	O'Conor, D.	Winterbotham, H. S
Ewing, H. E. C.	O'Donoghue, The	Woods, H.
Eykyn, R.	Ogilvy, Sir J.	Young, Sir G.
Finnie, W.	O'Loghlen, Sir C.	

The following Liberal members (25) who voted for Mr. Miall's motion last year, were absent from the division this year, but 7 of them paired:—

Bagwell, J.	Fordyce, W. D.	Potter, T. B.
Beaumont, W. B.	Goldsmid, Sir F.	Price, W. E.
Beaumont, S. A.	Heron, D. C.	Roden, W. S.
Beaumont, Capt.	Leeman, G.	Shaw, W.
Bentall, E. H.	Lewis, J. D.	Smith, J. B.
Campbell, H.	Loch, G.	Smith, E.
Carnegie, Hon. C.	McLaren, D.	Stacpoole, W.
Clay, J.	Platt, J. (dead)	Stevenson, J. C.
Ewing, H. E. C.		

perty, but as that subject had been so often brought under the notice of the House by the hon. member for North Warwickshire, he would not dwell further upon it. He might also say that the Wesleyans and the Quakers had never concealed the fact that they possessed considerable property. The Jews, again, were also in possession of considerable property — (laughter) — he meant for religious purposes. He wished, however, to confine his remarks chiefly to those religious bodies which used to be called "the three denominations," but which were sometimes now spoken of as "the Free Churches." The member for Bradford had made an admission to-night which went further than any he had made before. He divided Church property into two classes—the older and the more recent. Now, he was ready to place the property of the Nonconformist body in the latter category, although he contended that both classes of property ought to be protected by the State. In the "Congregational Year Book" for the present year, the Rev. J. Baldwin Brown said :—

Of all the curses with which a spiritual community can be visited the worst is property—that is, property to be laid up in treasuries and administered by authorities.

Again, the Rev. Dr. Rees, in a paper contributed to the same annual, expressed himself as follows :—

The excellent Lady Barham built seven small chapels at her own expense in the Gower district, but through her mistaken benevolence in endowing most of them they are to this day weak and dependent on those miserable crutches, and only now beginning to learn the healthy exercise of their own wings.

While on this point, he might quote a statement made by his hon. friend the member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) in a debate in that House some years ago on the Trustees of Charities Bill. His hon. friend said :—

They (the Dissenters) neither cared for nor wanted any endowments. It was a fact worthy of consideration that out of 25,000 places of worship that Dissenters had in Great Britain only 100 or 200—and those were of old standing—had received an endowment, and even these were from private benevolence. In more modern times the Dissenters did not endow their places of worship, but trusted to the voluntary principle.

He would now illustrate by a few examples the practice of modern Nonconformists with regard to endowments. Mr. Remington Mills, formerly a member of that House, built a Congregational church at Egham, and endowed it with 70*l.* a year in house property when he left the neighbourhood. In one of those houses the minister lived, while the other two were devoted to purposes connected with the church. The late Sir Francis Crossley was also, he believed, a strong supporter of endowments. On the 7th of June last his will was quoted in the *Times*, and it appeared that among the bequests was one of 1,000*l.* to the Congregational Pastors' Retiring Fund, which was an endowed society with a capital of 88,000*l.* Sir F. Crossley also left 1,000*l.* to Airedale College, Bradford, besides making certain provisions with respect to the endowment of the almshouses erected by him at Halifax, and for the completion of any unfulfilled arrangements in connection with the Crossley Orphan Home and School, the majority of the governors of which institution were chosen by pastors and deacons of certain Independent churches. Again, the chairman of the anniversary meeting at Cheshunt College in 1869 mentioned in his speech, in terms of commendation, the endeavour of the Calvinistic Methodist body to raise an endowment of 20,000*l.* for their college at Trevecca, and of the success of the Rev. Edward Matthews in raising 18,000*l.* of this sum ; and the report said that this college would be for Wales "an inestimable and everlasting blessing." That speech was delivered by Mr. Henry Richard, whom he believed he might identify with the hon. member for Merthyr-Tydvil: ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) Leaving this matter, he would next consider what information we possessed as to Nonconformist endowments. The reports of the Charity Commissioners showed that endowments connected with Dissenting places of worship existed in nearly every county ; but it was a singular fact that the "Congregational Year Book," the "Baptist Hand Book," the "Presbyterian Almanack," and the "Unitarian Almanack," although they gave lists of these places of worship, made no mention whatever of any endowments. (Hear.) He would, however, give the House, from other sources, some particulars affecting well-known charities. In 1704 Lady Hewley left property to seven trustees for various Dissenting objects, and in the year 1842, after great litigation, the suit was decided in favour of the retention of these endowments by the orthodox Dissenters. According to the latest returns of the Charity Commissioners the rents and dividends received by the trustees amounted to 6,000*l.* or 7,000*l.* a year, in addition to which they had invested in stock upwards of 40,000*l.*, and 1,700*l.* recently in the London and Westminster Bank. As to another charity—Coward's Trust—he had only arrived at a knowledge of the facts by accident, but this charity would be interesting to the House from the fact that Dr. Isaac Watts was one of the executors, from which circumstance the date of the commencement of the charity was fixed at the early part of the eighteenth century. Various objects were specified in the original bequest, which concluded thus :—"And for such other charitable and useful purposes as they, or the major part of them, judge to be most conclusive to the interests of true religion among Protestant Dissenters." The trustees in the present day were Dr. Stoughton, the Rev. T. Binney, and two other gentlemen not ministers of religion. Their whole income in the year 1871 was 3,442*l.*, and of this they granted for the education of students 1,100*l.*, and for the building of chapels and paying off debts 1,305*l.* Here, therefore, were the funds of a charity appropriated to the building of chapels, which were constantly paraded as the great triumphs of the voluntary system. (Cheers,) He did not wish to weary the House with details, but he would refer any hon. members who might wish to follow up the subject to Davis's Charity, Hanson's Charity, Chamberlaine's, Hollis's, Wilton's, Creed's, and numerous other charities and funds of a similar nature. While the hon. member for Bradford had all the materials which he required ready to his hand, he himself had been compelled to prosecute an active search, like a miner in Australia digging for gold, sometimes finding a few grains and sometimes lighting on a considerable nugget. But he had reason to believe that the vein was by no means exhausted, and that he had only arrived at the beginning of it. (Cheers.) He wished to add a word on the subject of endowed colleges in the possession of the Nonconformist bodies. Dr. Allon, in a paper read by him on the subject of the amalgamation of colleges, said, "We possess 16 collegiate institutions, having 38 professors, 368 students, and an aggregate income of about 25,000*l.* a year." How much of this was derived from endowments he was unable to say, but there was some evidence that the proportion must be very considerable. Passing by the other colleges, he would direct attention to the case of New College, which might be regarded as a model institution. Dr. Pye-Smith, in laying the first stone of this college in 1850, said that it would unite three old colleges—Homerton, Torrington-square, and Highbury—of which the earliest was founded soon after the time of William III. He also stated that "the pious men of that day did not seem to think it necessary to ascertain that their sons had the qualification for the ministry, and it was not until the institutions now united were founded that the satisfactory evidence of conversion to God in encouraging any young man to devote himself to the ministry was thoroughly understood to be of imperative and absolute necessity." In the language of the present day, that would mean that "tests" were not at first in vogue, but afterwards were found to be necessary. (Laughter.) "The candidates were required to be members of some Congregational Church and sixteen years old, to be able to adduce testimony of one or more Congregational ministers and of the church with which he was in fellowship to his consistent piety, mental ability, and general fitness for ministerial work." After all these an application in writing was to be sent in, and the council were to decide whether they would admit the candidate to an interview. The House, doubtless, would concur with him that the tests thus imposed were much more strict than those in vogue in Oxford or Cambridge in what hon. members opposite would call their worst days. Cheers.) To the college at Cheshunt peculiar importance was attached because it professed to be an undenominational college. But Dr. Allon in his address at the opening of the new buildings, said :—

Any student, when his education is finished, is at perfect liberty to exercise his ministry in whatever section of the Church of Christ he may prefer. The fact that so many of its *alumni* now enter the Congregational ministry is owing solely to changes in Church parties and popular sympathies.

In other words, this undenominational college was gradually becoming absorbed by the Congregational body. (Hear, hear.) At this college the series of questions submitted to candidates for admission was exceedingly searching. One of these he might, perhaps, be permitted to read :—"What reason have you for believing that you have experienced a saving work of grace upon your heart, at what period of your life, and by what means do you consider the change to have taken place? (To be answered very fully.)" The next question was :—"Can you cordially subscribe the fifteen articles subjoined to these questions?" (Laughter.) In a case submitted to the hon. and learned member for Richmond and the present Vice-Chancellor Wickens, the President, Dr. Reynolds, says :—

These Articles, taken principally from the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, are skilfully interwoven with some of the more important clauses of the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and while they carefully preserve the evangelical fervour of the originals, they avoid some of their crudities and are studiously comprehensive in all matters affecting Church policy.

As to the protection which the law afforded to these endowments, he would merely observe that the courts of the country were freely employed in reference to them, and that not merely with reference to the property of the various Dissenting bodies, but on points connected with their peculiar doctrines, as to which the Nonconformists appeared to be as completely "under Egyptian bondage" as members of the Established Church were popularly supposed to be. (Laughter.) One of the cases which had come before the law courts many years ago, was that relating to the Hewley Charity, which gave rise to a vast amount of litigation, and which was the principal cause of the legislation which was subsequently effected on the subject of the property held by Dissenting bodies. Many hon. members would recollect the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act in 1844 by Sir Robert Peel, the first clause of which made lawful the tenure, and confirmed persons in possession of property appropriated to Dissenting purposes which were unlawful prior to passing of certain recited enabling acts, and enacted that all deeds and documents relating to them be construed as if such acts had been in force at the time of the foundation of such meeting-houses. Clause 2 enacted that "religious doctrines or opinions for the preaching or promotion of which the meeting-house may be held, is to be collected from twenty-five years' usage, when not expressly stated in the trust-deed." In Skeats's "History of the Free Churches," published in 1869, by Mr. A. Miall—(a laugh)—it was stated that "the act, so far as it limited inquiry into the right to property, was in harmony with previous laws, and so far as it was calculated to prevent litigation was in harmony with the best civil and religious interests of society." The Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, in his address on the principles of trust-deeds, said :—

Many of the most eminent of our ministers are preaching under trust-deeds containing statements of doctrine which nothing would induce them to utter from the pulpits.

(Laughter.) Again, of late years there had been passed the following acts protecting the property of Dissenting bodies : the 13th and 14th Vict., cap. 28, called Sir Morton Peto's Act, for rendering more simple and effectual the law by which societies for religious worship hold property, the 31st and 32nd Vict., facilitating the acquisition of sites for religious purposes, the 32nd and 33rd of Vict., cap. 26, enabling Dissenters to acquire burial-grounds, and the 33rd and 34th Vict., cap. 34, called the Charitable Funds Investment Act, enabling trustees for public and charitable purposes to invest the funds intrusted to them in real securities. Another instance of the interference of the legislature with property held by Dissenting bodies was furnished by the Charity Commission, which received three or four applications a week to frame new trusts for property so held. The preparing and carrying into effect of these new trusts involved a cost to the country of 10,000*l.* a year, which was paid out of the Consolidated Fund, and he thought that the people at large had a right to complain that such a large sum was annually abstracted from their pockets for the exclusive benefit of the Dissenters. (Hear.) He trusted that he had said sufficient to show that there were great endowments possessed by the Dissenters ; that that property was to a certain extent protected by law, and that therefore the proposals of the hon. members for Bradford and Frome were open to the objection that they were partial and did not embrace the whole question. In the improbable event of either of those proposals being carried, he should take the sense of the House upon the resolution of which he had given notice, and he gave the hon. member for Bradford fair warning that such was the way in which his joke would end. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) The hon. member for Huddersfield, in seconding the motion, had stood forth as a political Dissenter. He begged to remind the hon. member that a century ago we had had political Churchmen in this country—men who had done a great deal of harm to the Church, and he wished to know whether it had never crossed the hon. member's mind that political Dissenters might do a great deal of harm to the free churches of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) The political Dissenters, by their attempts, might prevent the Church of England from giving her undivided attention to that internal work which she was now engaged upon, and they might succeed in capturing some of her outworks ; but even if they were to succeed in overthrowing her altogether, he did not believe that the free churches of this country would be then in existence to enjoy their triumph over her, and their acts would remain to prove to students of history that as great mistakes had been committed by ecclesiastical bodies in the 19th century as had been committed in any of the previous centuries. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GLADSTONE : Although I do not doubt that the House is quite prepared to arrive at a decision upon the motion and the amendment upon it which is now before them, still I do not think it would be respectful to the hon. member for Bradford and those with whom he acts were the Government to give a silent vote upon this question. While fully admitting the ability with which this question has been brought forward, we must all have felt that there is a certain want of definite purpose and reality in the proposal to which we are asked to accede--(Hear, hear.)—and that not because we have not a sufficient subject of debate before us, but because we are labouring under the difficulty of having too much put before us at one time. The hon. member for Bradford, having on his hands the gigantic question of the disestablishment of the Established Church, has found it expedient not to simplify but to further complicate and enlarge his task by mixing up with the main question an inquiry which involved matters of fact which are entirely distinct from the question of principle he has already raised. The hon. member for Frome has, however, gone even further, and has asked us to extend this inquiry, and to undertake an even more complicated subject—that of the redistribution of the property of the Established Church. The hon. member for West Surrey has also just now asked us to still further extend this inquiry to the property possessed by other ecclesi-

astical bodies in the kingdom besides the Established Church, as if the original subject was not quite sufficient to occupy us for three or four hours on a summer evening in July. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) There is one argument against the motion of the hon. member for Bradford which its opponents appear to have overlooked, which is that if this commission is appointed we should get rid of the hon. member and his motion for several years to come while this inquiry was pending. ("Hear," and a laugh.) The hon. member has cast his net very widely. He proposes to inquire not only into the amount but the nature and origin of ecclesiastical property now appropriated to the use of the Establishment. I did not gather from his speech at what point in the chronology of the human race he proposes to commence this inquiry. Probably he would be satisfied with beginning at the time of Melchisedec. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) The hon. member, instead of going straight to the heart and root of the question of principle he has raised, proposes to involve us in a preliminary inquiry of which we cannot see the end. The Government are in no degree reconciled to the object of my hon. friend by this change which he has made. I confess that I don't see that any case—I mean any sufficient case—has been made out for any of the proposals which have been brought before us to-night. With respect to capitular property and the cathedral system of this country, I hardly think that my hon. friend the member for Huddersfield—who always addresses the House with great ability—can believe that the impartiality of his speech and its historical fairness were as conspicuous as the talent which he invariably brings to bear on any argument he puts forward. My hon. friend, in justice to many of the eminent persons connected with these establishments, ought really to have referred to the great and successful efforts made within the last ten or fifteen years by the deans and chapters of many cathedrals, and not least of the two in this metropolis, for the purpose of making them powerful, living centres of religious activity—efforts which have met with a response from the inhabitants of this capital which will be ever memorable in our annals. (Hear, hear.) With reference to the redistribution of the property of the Church, pray let it be recollected that that is a matter which thirty or thirty-five years ago occupied much of the attention of statesmen and of Parliament, and that much has been done to remove the greater anomalies which formerly struck the eye. The extremes of wealth in the high places of the Church have been retrenched—not to the extent, perhaps, which my hon. friends might desire, but still with the effect of greatly cutting down the emoluments of those who held some of the highest and most responsible positions. On the other hand, that which did amount to a scandal, the beggarly character of the stipends, I don't say enjoyed, but received by many of the most laborious of the clergy—(Hear)—has been in a very considerable degree mitigated, if not removed, by the application of a very large portion of that cathedral property to which my hon. friend in that part of his speech, I must say, so obscurely referred. It is all very well to talk of a further redistribution of the property of the Church of England—of its parochial property, which constitutes the great mass of the property that it possesses. But when we pass from general, brief, and superficial discussions of this kind to grapple with details, everyone knows that you are met by peculiarities of the system, the growth of many generations of men, in one point of view impeding you by the extraordinary closeness of the intermixture of social and proprietary interests connected with the arrangement of the property of the Church; and, on the other hand, exhibiting an intimate union between the Church of England and the families of this country such as I venture to tell my hon. frind whenever his question of disestablishment, instead of being a debating question, becomes a practical question, will offer to him and to those who are associated with him very serious and very difficult matters to deal with. (Cheers.) I don't think, in regard to an inquiry, that my hon. friend can suppose that there is any reason why any great machinery should be put in motion to elicit facts with the general character of which Parliament and the country are acquainted, and with the minute character of which there is no reason why we should seek an acquaintance, except, perhaps, with the view of resuming at a future and distant year his motion for disestablishment, if we should accede to his present proposal. But if this motion cannot be supported as a motion directed to the substantive aims and ends of inquiry, neither are we prepared to support it as a motion intended for the attainment of ulterior purposes. Sir, it is not at this time of the night that I shall endeavour to make a speech on the enormous—the almost unmeasured questions that are involved in the subject of the disestablishment of the Church of England. My hon. friend has referred to the challenge which he says he received from me when I endeavoured to point out to him that if he wished to procure the acceptance of the opinions that he holds by the Parliament and the country he must begin by making a progress which he never yet has achieved—by converting to those opinions the people of this country. He refers and he may refer with some justice to the general progress of opinion and of affairs on the Continent of Europe. There is no doubt that circumstances have occurred in connection with the organisation of the Church of Rome in particular which have given an impulse more or less in other countries to the cause which my hon. friend has in hand. I am very doubtful whether they may have had a similar effect in this country. (Hear, hear.) I am very doubtful whether they may not have produced a reaction in the minds of the people of this country, who rather shrink from the contemplation of what they have been witnessing as a whole abroad, and who may be supposed to attach am additional value to what they possess with all its drawbacks, owing to the experience through which they see other nations passing in matters of religion. At any rate, I do not think my hon. friend has reached a point at which he is entitled to present this question to the House of Commons as one to be debated in a practical sense and with a view to a practical decision. I almost feel—I hope he will not think me disrespectful to him in saying this—that we are called on to-night to discharge the functions of a debating society rather than the ordinary duties of the British Parliament. (Hear.) His object seems to be remote—so remote from the wishes of the people of England—(cheers)—the estimate which has been formed of the work which has to be done in order to bring about a different state of things appears to me, I confess, to be so inadequate that, notwithstanding the undoubted ability, earnestness, and sincerity of my hon. friend, and no one possesses more earnestness or sincerity than he does—notwithstanding those qualities, I cannot but feel that a theoretical aspect and character seems to be spread over this discussion, which deprives it of much of that interest and reality which we recognise when we are dealing with questions that have relation to results and are within our power and faculty of calculation. Therefore, even if the time were more convenient than it is, there could be no necessity for me to lead the House into a lengthened discussion on the great subject which my hon. friend has to-night more indistinctly indicated. I don't wish to be understood as altogether putting aside on the part of the Government proposals made by my hon. friend the member for Frome and others with regard to the reforms which may be found practicable in the distribution of the property of the Church. What I do think is, that we are not prepared to enter wholesale upon those reforms. It is idle to suppose that they can be dealt with unless Parliament is prepared to give to them much of its time and attention—much more of its time and attention than the other calls upon it are likely to permit of its bestowing. And I must say that even my hon. friend opposite who seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Frome must himself have been sensible, when he had made all the deductions and all the qualifications that he felt to be necessary with regard to the rights of property, with regard to the respect due to vested interests, with regard to the necessity or expediency of preserving prizes in the Church, that the field for action in the province which he marked out for himself was really much more narrow than he might at first have supposed. But whatever is to be said upon this subject should be said as distinct from the motion before us. The connection of the two matters can only lead to confusion. I look, therefore, for a moment to the motion of my hon. friend the member for Bradford as entirely apart from these propositions of internal reform, and, so looking at it, I am bound to say that while I can see no reason why we should enter upon this lengthened and elaborate inquiry into matters of fact when we are already possessed of abundant information for all practical purposes, we are still less disposed to give countenance to this motion if we are to consider the ulterior purposes which my hon. friend has alluded to. (Hear.) He has distinctly, and by a process perfectly legitimate from his point of view, given us to understand that he wishes to collect the facts, and to be in possession of them in the most complete and accurate form, in order that he may afterwards found upon them proposals of extended constitutional change. To these proposals we are not friendly; we are not prepared to give them a present welcome; we are not prepared to look upon them as proposals which can be taken up by the administration that now exists in any future year. That being so, we think it best that we should at once decline to take shelter under the modified character of the demand my hon. friend makes upon us for the moment; we will not look at it, though I must at once admit that no fundamental objection can be taken in principle to the inquiry when treated simply as an inquiry. It is fair to him as well as to the House that we should take into our view the purpose for which that inquiry is to be directed, and as that purpose is one which we are not prepared to entertain we must ask the House to join with us in voting against the motion.

On the announcement of the numbers, Mr. Miall and several Nenconformist members left the House amid ironical cheering from the Opposition.

On Mr. Hughes's amendment being put there was a general cry of "withdraw," but a member below the gangway insisted on a division.

The House then divided—

For the amendment	41
Against it	270
Majority	—229

Some formal business was then proceeded with, and the House adjourned at two o'clock.

MR. MIALL'S MOTION.—THE DIVISION.

The following members (96) supported the motion:—

Adair, H. E.	Graham, W.	Phillips, R. N.
Anderson, G.	Grieve, J. J.	Plimsoll, S.
Armitstead, G.	Hadfield, G.	Potter, E.
Baines, E.	Harris, J. D.	Price, W. P.
Barry, A. H. S.	Herbert, A. E. W.	Rathbone, W.
Bazley, Sir T.	Hoare, Sir H. A.	Reed, C.
Bentall, E. H.	Holland, S.	Richard, H.
Blennerhassett, Sir	Holms, J.	Richards, E. M.
Brewer, Dr.	Howard, J.	Russell, Lord A.
Bright, J.	Illingworth, A.	Rylands, P.
Brogden, A.	Johnston, A.	Samuelson, H. B.
Brown, A. H.	Kensington, Lord	Sartoris, E. J.
Buckley, N.	Kinnaird, Hn. A. F.	Seely, C. (Lin.)
Callan, P.	Lawrence, Sir J. C.	Shaw, R.
Candlish, J.	Lawrence, W.	Sheridan, H. B.
Carnegie, Hon. C.	Lawson, Sir W.	Smyth, P. J.
Carter, R. M.	Lush, Dr.	Stepney, Sir J.
Chadwick, D.	Lusk, A.	Taylor, P. A.
Clifford, C. C.	Macfie, R. A.	Torrens, R. R.
Colman, J. J.	Mackintosh, E. W.	Trevelyan, G. O.
Cowen, Sir J.	M'Arthur, W.	Villiers, C. P.
Craufurd, E. H. J.	M'Clure, T.	Wegueiin, T. M.
Davies, R.	Maguire, J. F.	Whalley, G. H.
Delahunty, J.	Marling, S. S.	White, J.
Digby, K. T.	Melly, G.	Williams, W.
Dilke, Sir C. W.	Miller, J.	Willyams, E. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.	Morgan, G. O.	Wingfield, Sir C.
Dixon, G.	Morley, S.	Young, A. W.
Fawcett, H.	Morrison, W.	
Fitzmaurice, Lord.	Mundella, A. J.	TELLERS.
Fothergill, R.	Muntz, P. H.	Mr. Miall.
Gilpin, C.	Palmer, J. H.	Mr. Leatham.
Gourley, E. T.	Parry, L. J.	

The following Liberal members (96) opposed the motion:—

Akroyd, E.	Egerton, Capt. F.	Lloyd, Sir T. D.
Amcotts, Col. W. C.	Enfield, Viscount	Locke, J.
Antrobus, Sir E.	FitzGerald, Ld. O. A.	Lorne, Marquis of
Ayrton, Rt. Hn. A.	Fitzwilliam, Hon. C.	Lowe, Rt. Hon. R.
Bass, A.	Foljambe, F. J. S.	Lyttelton, Hn. C. G.
Bonham-Carter, J.	Forster, Hn. W. E.	M'Lagan, P.
Bouverie, Rt. Hn. E.	Foster, W. H.	Martin, P. W.
Bowmont, Marquis	Fortescue, Hn. D. F.	Maxwell, W.
Bowring, E. A.	Fortescue, Hn. C. P.	Mitchell, T. A.
Brand, H. R.	Gladstone, W. E.	Monk, C. J.
Brassey, T.	Gladstone, W. H.	Nicholson, W.
Bristowe, S. B.	Goschen, Hon. G. J.	Palmer, Sir R.
Bruce, Lord C.	Gower, Hn. E. F. L.	Peel, A. W.
Bruce, H. A.	Greville, Hon. Capt.	Pim, J.
Buller, Sir E.	Grosvenor, Hon. N.	Portman, W. B.
Campbell, H.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Cardwell, Rt. Hn. E.	Guest, M.	Stansfeld, Hon. J.
Carington, Capt.	Harcourt, V.	Stapleton, J.
Cavendish, Lord F.	Hardcastle, J. A.	Stuart, Col.
Cavendish, Lord G.	Headlam, T. E.	Talbot, Hon. C.
Coleridge, Sir J. D.	Henley, Lord	Tollemache, Hon. F.
Colthurst, Sir G.	Henry, M.	Tollemache, Maj. W.
Cowper-Temple, W.	Hibbert, J. T.	Torrens, W. T. M.
Cowper, Hn. H. F.	Hodgson, K. D.	West, H. W.
Crawford, R. W.	Hughes, T.	Whatman, J.
Dalrymple, Dr.	Hurst, R. H.	Whitbread, S.
Denison, C. B.	Jardine, R.	Whitwell, J.
Denman, Hon. G.	Jessel, Sir G.	Williamson, Sir H.
Dent, J. D.	Johnstone, Sir H.	
Dodson, J. G.	K.-Shuttleworth, U.	TELLERS.
Dowse, R.	Kingscote, Col.	Mr. Glyn.
Duff, M. E. Grant	Lasdett, W.	Mr. Adam.
Edwards, H.	Lefevre, G. J.	

The following Liberal members (172) were absent from the division, but, as will be seen, 12 of them paired in favour:—

Acland, Sir T. D.	Fitzwilliam, H.	Onslow, G.
Agar-Ellis, Major	Fletcher, I.	O'Reilly-Dease, M.
Allen, W. S.	Fordyce, W. D.	O'Reilly, M. W.
Amory, J. H.	Forster, C.	Osborne, R. B.
Anstruther, Sir R.	Fowler, W.	Otway, A. J.
Aytoun, R. S.	French, Col.	Parker, C. S.
Backhouse, E.	Gavin, Major	Pease, J. W.
Bagwell, J.	Goldsmid, Sir F.	Peel, Sir R.
Baker, R. B. W.	Goldsmid, Julian	Pelham, Lord
Barclay, A. C.	Gray, Sir J.	Pender, J.
Bass, M. T.	Grey, Sir G.	Playfair, Dr.
Bassett, W.	Grosvenor, Capt.	Potter, T. B.
Baxter, W. E.	Grove, T. F.	Power, J. T.
Beaumont, Capt. F.	Hamilton, H.	Price, W. E.
Beaumont, W. B.	Hanmer, Sir J.	Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Beaumont, S. A.	Hartington, Marq of	Robertson, D.
Biddulph, M.	Haviland Burke, E.	Roden, W. S.
Blennerhassett, R.	Henderson, J.	Rothschild, Baron L.
Bolckow, H. W. F.	Herbert, H. A.	Rothschild, Baron M
Brady, J.	Heron, D. C.	Rothschild, N. M.
Bright, J.	Hodgkinson, G.	St. Aubyn, J.
Brinckman, Capt.	Horsman, E.	St. Lawrence, Visct.
Brocklehurst, W.	Hoskyns, C. W.	Salomons, Sir D.
Browne, G. E.	Howard, C.	Samuda, J. D'A.
Bryan, G. L.	Hughes, W. B.	Samuelson, B.
Bury, Visct.	Hutt, Sir W.	Saunderson, E. J.
Ball, Dr.	Jones, H.	Seely, C., jun.,
Cadogan, Hon. F. W.	King, P. J. L.	Seymour, A.
Cartwright, W. F.	K.-Hugessen, E. H.	Shaw, W.
Cave, T.	Lambert, N. G.	Sherlock, D.
Chambers, M.	Lancaster, J.	Sherriff, A. C.
Chambers, Sir T.	Lea, T.	Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Childers, H.	Leeman, G.	Smith, J. B.
Cholmeley, Capt.	Lewis, H.	Smith, T. E.
Cholmeley, Sir M.	Lewis, J. D.	Stacpoole, Capt.
Clay, J.	Lubbock, Sir J.	Stanley, W. O.
Cogan, Rt. Hn. W.	MacEvoy, E.	Stevenson, J. C.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.	Leith, J. F.	Stone, W. H.
Corrigan, Sir D.	M'Lean, J. R.	Storks, Sir H. K.
Dalglish, R.	M'Laren, D.	Strutt, Hn. H.
D'Arcy, M. P.	M'Mahon, P.	Synan, E. J.
Davie, Sir H.	Magniac, C.	Tite, Sir W.
Dease, E.	Maitland, Sir A.	Tomline, G.
De la Poer, E.	Martin, J.	Tracy, C. H.
Dickinson, S. S.	Matheson, A.	Trelawny, Sir J.
Dodds, J.	Merry, J.	Verney, Sir H.
Downing, M. C.	Milbank, F.	Vivian, H. H.
Duff, R. W.	Monsell, Hon. W.	Vivian, A. P.
Dundas, F.	Murphy, N. D.	Walter, J.
Ellice, E.	Nicol, J. D.	Wedderburn, Sir D.
Ennis, J. J.	O'Brien, Sir P.	Wells, W.
Erskine, Admiral	O'Conor Don.	Whitworth, T.
Esmonde, Sir J.	O'Conor, D.	Winterbotham, H. S
Ewing, H. E. C.	O'Donoghue, The	Woods, H.
Eykyn, R.	Ogilvy, Sir J.	Young, Sir G.
Finnie, W.	O'Loghlen, Sir C.	

The following Liberal members (25) who voted for Mr. Miall's motion last year, were absent from the division this year, but 7 of them paired:—

Bagwell, J.	Fordyce, W. D.	Potter, T. B.
Beaumont, W. B.	Goldsmid, Sir F.	Price, W. E.
Beaumont, S. A.	Heron, D. C.	Roden, W. S.
Beaumont, Capt.	Leeman, G.	Shaw, W.
Bentall, E. H.	Lewis, J. D.	Smith, J. B.
Campbell, H.	Loch, G.	Smith, E.
Carnegie, Hon. C.	McLaren, D.	Stacpoole, W.
Clay, J.	Platt, J. (dead)	Stevenson, J. C.
Ewing, H. E. C.		

The following Liberal members (22), who were absent last year, voted for the motion this year :—

Blennerhassett, R. (new)	Lawrence, Sir J. C.	Samuelson, H. B.
	Lawrence, W.	Sartoris, E. J.
Brogden, A.	Macfie, R. A.	Smyth, D. J. (new)
Chadwick, D.	Mackintosh, E. W.	Torrens, R. R.
Clifford, C. C.	Maguire, J. F.	Villiers, C. P.
Herbert, Hon. A.	Marling, S. S.	Weguelin, T.
Kensington, Lord	Palmer, J. H.	Willyams, E. W. B.
Kinnaird, Hon. A.	Plimsoll, S.	

The following Liberal members (6), who voted against the motion of last year, voted in favour of the recent motion :—

Adair, H. E.	Grieve, J. J.	Johnston, A.
Baxley, T.	Holms, J.	Russell, Lord A.

Sixty-six members repeated their votes.

Of the members who supported the motion, either by voting or pairing, there were :—

	This year.		Last year.	
English	... ...	67	English	58
Scotch	... ...	11	Scotch	13
Irish	... ...	10	Irish	10
Welsh	... ...	12	Welsh	10
Metropolitan	... ...	8	Metropolitan	5
		108		96

Of the Liberal members who voted against the motion there were :—

	This year.		Last year.	
English	... ...	71	English	89
Scotch	... ...	9	Scotch	18
Irish	... ...	9	Irish	12
Welsh	... ...	4	Welsh	6
Metropolitan	... ...	3	Metropolitan	9
		96		134

The following are some results of an analysis of the divisions in the two years :—

In 1871 there voted for the motion 89. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 5. Total supporters, 96.

In 1872 there voted for the motion 94. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 12. Total supporters, 108.

In 1871 there voted against the motion 374. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 5. Total opponents, 381.

In 1872 there voted against the motion 295. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 12. Total opponents, 307.

It is curious to notice that 96 Liberals voted for the motion of 1872, which was the exact number, including pairs, that supported it in 1871.

In 1871 no fewer than 146 Liberals absented themselves unpaired ; this year, as will be seen, that number has been increased to 160.

Last year the majority against the motion was composed of 134 Liberals, 242 Conservatives.

This year the majority was composed of 96 Liberals and 199 Conservatives.

In support of Mr. Hughes's amendment there were 43 Liberals, of whom 14 voted against Mr. Miall, while 3 who were absent on Mr. Miall's division voted with Mr. Hughes.

PAIRS.

For.		Against.
Mr. Stevenson	... ...	Colonel Jervis.
Mr. Crum-Ewing	... ...	Mr. Matheson.
Mr. J. B. Smith	... ...	Colonel Gray.
Mr. Dalglish	... ...	Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Pease	... ...	Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen.
Colonel Roden	... ...	Mr. Peek.
Capt. Stacpoole	... ...	Mr. Meyrick.
Mr. Whitworth	... ...	Mr. Bourke.
Mr. Backhouse	... ...	Sir R. Anstruther.
Mr. T. B. Potter	... ...	Sir G. Jenkinson.
Mr. G. Onslow	... ...	Mr. Floyer.

Mr. J. D. Lewis, in consequence of indisposition preventing him from staying for the division, paired in favour of Mr. Miall's motion with Mr. O'Reilly Dease against.

It is stated in the *Times* that Mr. Holms, having misapprehended the purport of the question put on Mr. Miall's motion, voted with him instead of against him.

THE PRESS ON MR. MIALL'S MOTION.

The *Times*, assuming that Mr. Miall admits that there is no popular feeling in favour of disestablishment, and asserting that the nation is sensible of no grievance in the existing position of the Church, and scarcely betrays any interest in the assaults made upon it, thinks that the hon. member is put out of court as a practical adviser. The Irish case confirms this view by force of contrast. It would be sheer waste of legislative power and of deliberative energy to entertain proposals thus based on no public demand or popular necessity. When our institutions are found to work ill it is quite time enough to think of pulling them up by the roots, and even then common wisdom would suggest an attempt to reform them with as little destruction as possible. Mr. Miall wants information which, as he conceives, will justify his demand for disestablishment. But again he betrays the same inability to look at his subject from a practical point of view. He asks for a Royal Commission. If the Dissenters would pledge themselves to abstain from any further agitation until such a commission had made a full and accurate report on all these points, the friends of the Church would do well to procure its instant appointment. Doomsday itself would be likely to arrive before any ecclesiastical Doomsday Book would provide accurate particulars respecting the origin of revenues dating back to Saxon times. But, even if such information could be obtained, what would be its practical value? The question is by what right and on what conditions the property is held now, not on what terms it was given in an obscure antiquity. As Mr. Gladstone urged, a minute knowledge of these details is totally unnecessary for any practical purpose Mr. Miall has in view. Quite enough is known of the revenues of the Church to afford material for a *prima facie* case, either for or against it ; and if Mr. Miall cannot convert the people to his views by the facts already at his disposal, he certainly would not be any more successful with the aid of a royal commission. As far as the moral and spiritual welfare of the country is concerned, nothing is more to be deprecated than that the attention of the clergy should be diverted from their ministerial duties to the excitement of a political struggle for existence.

Already a mischievous association for Church defence has been called into existence, and the time of the clergy is greatly wasted in discussing new schemes of organisation. The best defence for the Church is patient practical work in elevating the moral and spiritual character of the people. Its dangers are internal, and lie in the extravagancies of its extreme sections. If the friends of the Church are wise, they will devote all their influence to controlling and moderating the various movements within her pale, and extending her means of usefulness.

Writing on Tuesday (before the debate) the *Daily News* denies that the Anglican Establishment is national in character as well as in name. It is the Church of the English State, but it does not even claim to be the Church of the whole English people. It is the largest, the oldest, the wealthiest, the most popular, the most powerful, the most comprehensive of all the sects into which English Protestantism is divided ; but it is a sect, and as such it cannot permanently occupy the position of a national Church. How is this fact to be dealt with? To make the Church really national might have been done before the Act of Uniformity which laid the foundation of religious disunion, but not now :—

Could the Established Church be made to include the wide diversity of religious thought which exists among us? Can we imagine Mr. Bennett and Mr. Voysey ; Canon Liddon and Mr. Martineau ; Dr. Allon and Dean Stanley ; Bishop Colenso and Dr. Rigg, forming part of the same ecclesiastical organisation, and working together as integral parts of one national institution? It is, indeed, possible to imagine it, but hardly possible to fit it in with the actual world. It is Utopia ; a Utopia, however, which is not all a dream. Everybody feels its fascination. When it is expounded by such writers as the Dean of Westminster, it is impossible not to wish it were possible. A Church which should be as large as the nation's thought, as comprehensive as the nation's religion, would be national indeed. But how can such a state of things be brought about? Lord Shaftesbury finds a wide response among laymen to a suggestion for the modification of a clause in a creed or a direction in a rubric ; but what say the ecclesiastical powers? Convocation will not touch it. Parliament dares not meddle, since there is no knowing where meddling will end. At such a time, to be talking of a National Church, made really national by a wide comprehension which shall give room to all forms of the nation's faith, is to waste valuable time. The problem is incapable of this solution, which nowhere really comes in contact with practical statesmanship.

The eventual triumph of the policy which Mr. Miall represents appears certain. We shall be driven to the policy of levelling down—a policy that has lost its terrors even for the clerical mind—since the Irish Church came so triumphantly through the process—

It will probably be done some day by general consent. The policy of comprehension is one of the possibilities of the past ; that of disestablishment has become the certainty of the future. The whole tendency of politics is to the entire severance of the two spheres of the State and the Church. This has been curiously illustrated in the education controversy. The vast majority of English society are agreed that education, to be complete, must include instruction in religion ; yet the whole movement which the Education Act has started is one for excluding the State from all interference with religious teaching. The parental idea of Government is exploded. The modern theory of the State is that it is a secular organisation for secular ends. This conception may not be complete, but it is the conception which really influences practical affairs. It has so complete possession of the public mind, that all our legislation will have to be brought into harmony with it.

Mr. Miall is therefore on the winning side.

The *Daily Telegraph* says that the union of Church and State is a fact involving a great principle, warmly defended by its friends and assailed by its enemies with intense animosity. "It is new to us that this contention on the high ground of principle can be affected by tables of figures, columns of statistics, bushels of hard facts. A statesman proposing to preserve and reform the Church, to reorganise its administration, and to redistribute its revenues, might usefully take up Mr. Miall's motion without his motive, and make it the basis of a grand bill. But we greatly fear that the time is hardly favourable for such a gigantic task." The *Telegraph*, though admitting that the Church does not comprise the whole of the English people, denies that it is not national. Its clergy are in every parish, the Church Liturgy is everywhere used—by the bedside of the friendless pauper, and in the chapel of the Queen. In some parishes the clergy do everything, and are frequently the solitary link between the destitute poor and the rich. If the Church is disestablished and disendowed, how is the gap to be filled in the rural parishes? It would be reversing the policy of the Education Act, if, by disestablishing the Church, we proclaimed our indifference to that educational process which always goes on in some shape or another where a number of men, women, and children are brought under the sway of lofty ideas expounded, even if only once a week, by an educated man. Every church closed by Mr. Miall would simply be a school shut up. Possibly the artists of the future may one day bless the memory of Mr. Miall, whose action against the Establishment would indirectly lead to the multiplication over England of picturesque ecclesiastical ruins. The *Telegraph* thinks that the true policy is to use our State power so as to make the wealth of the Church subserve, as far as possible, national ends.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* says that Mr. Miall's motion itself was a model of moderation, and his speech in its essence as Conservative and generally respectable, as if it had been delivered by an archbishop. Altogether, the debate was one which may be safely recommended to the notice of any person who fears that matters will go too quick in this country, and that we may find ourselves some day without notice in the middle of a revolution. But the motion was useless with a view to stop the spoliation cry—

People who talk about our pious forefathers, confiscation, the identity of the title to Church lands and the title to private property, and the rest of it, do not found their opinions on laborious inquiries into matters of fact, and would not surrender them if they were led to believe that certain huge folio volumes contained clear proof that in remote times tithes and other endowments were settled on the clergy by law and not by private benevolence.

The general result of the debate is, the *Pall Mall* thinks, to show that for the present, at least—using the word present so as to include probably the lifetime of the existing generation—the Church of England has nothing to fear from external attacks. What it may have to fear from internal causes is another question—

If it is to die, it will die from softening of the brain, and that is a slow and gradual complaint which often leaves the general appearance and the apparent vigour of the limbs and the trunk quite untouched for a great length of time. Some of its first symptoms are stammering, squinting, and unnatural stupidity.

The *Post* holds that nothing can be more insincere than the pretence that the interests of the Church are contemplated by Mr. Miall's motion. It is an overt act of the policy which aims at the destruction of the Church, and it asks House of Commons to interfere in a matter on which there is no public demand for its interference, in the hope of stirring up an agitation where no agitation exists.

The *Echo* concludes an article by saying :—

Perhaps, on mature consideration, Churchmen will not feel themselves quite satisfied with their numerical victory. It was too complete to be permanent. They have armed Mr. Miall with a distinct grievance with which to go to the country and to fan that agitation to which Mr. Gladstone invites him. He is not the person to neglect his opportunity. An excellent motion failed, we may say, in conclusion, because it came from Mr. Miall ; and no one suggested that that objectionable feature might have been removed, and that the Nonconformist motion might have been made a Church motion, by all Churchmen hastening to adopt it. If it was improper solely because it came from the editor of the *Nonconformist*, why did it not come from Mr. Gladstone?

The *Examiner* of last Saturday in an anticipatory article says that Mr. Miall's annual motion is based on solid, irrefragable principles, and it must triumph.

Every one acknowledges that, with the prodigious diversity of religious belief prevailing amongst us, there is no platform on which even the majority can meet for any hearty genuine worship. The spectacle presented by the Church of England shutting out Mr. Voysey and keeping in Mr. Bennett is an evidence that, like the image of Nebuchadnezzar, it is composed of too incongruous elements to be able to stand. We believe that the Privy Council is more anxious to preserve the comprehensiveness of the Church than possibly almost any other tribunal that might be set up ; but its failure is egregious, for it can only keep up the semblance of agreement in the Church by a sophistical treatment of language, which, if it were not honestly intended, would deserve to be called Jesuitical.

The *Examiner* expresses a confident belief that long before Mr. Miall's motion is carried the Established Church of Scotland will be numbered among the things of the past.

The signal has been given ; the great Assemblies of the Dissenting Churches have thrown down the gauntlet ; and the existence of the "Auld Kirk" may be regarded as not only menaced, but as already on the eve of destruction. The assailants in Scotland of the Established Church have put in the foreground of the battle the latitudinarianism and doctrinal unsoundness of the Established Church. The Free Church Assembly and the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church know the worth of a good cry, and they are quite aware that if the issue of orthodoxy and heterodoxy were left to the people of Scotland, the Established Church could not live a year. We shall see that the defenders of the Established Church will appeal to the ancient purity of its doctrines, and maintain the inflexible rigidity of its faith. . . . With the Dissenters in arms, we are at a loss to perceive where the Kirk can find succour. It has now formally asked Parliament to abolish patronage, the only badge by which it could distinguish itself from Dissent ; and, as it thus makes itself one in practice with the other Presbyterian Churches, it cannot claim the special privilege of endowment. Its fate cannot, therefore, be long delayed. Its boldest advocates do not pretend that more than 48 per cent. of the population adhere to the Established Church ; and even this figure can only be made out by reckoning as members of the "Kirk" all that are connected with any other religious denomination. We doubt if even thirty-six out of 100 could be relied upon to support the Establishment ; and if this be so, its fate at the ballot-box is easily predicted. When that is over, we shall have some prospect of a successful issue to Mr. Miall's motion.

After arguing that the ideal Church of the future, according to the views of comprehensionists—one which would embrace all sects—is visionary, because it would raise up perplexing and insoluble

problems, and involve concurrent endowment, the true issue is whether it is just that property belonging to the whole nation should be given up for the maintenance of one among many sects.

So long as the Church of England exists, the sovereign power—the electors—by implication asserts that the best use to which her revenues can be put is to maintain the sect introduced in Henry VIII.'s reign and consolidated by Elizabeth. Does the Church of England perform such inestimable service, beyond all other Churches, that while they are sent empty away from the Exchequer her coffers should be duly replenished? Put in another way, the question is whether a fraction, be it large or small, of the population should at the public expense be provided with religious services, while their neighbours must pay out of their own pockets for inferior accommodation. When we remember that the persons who may thus be described as spiritual paupers are the richest, and of all classes can best afford to pay for the ministrations of religion, there can be no hesitation in declaring the injustice and excessive unfairness of the present arrangement.

Epitome of News.

Her Majesty, who has been visiting the Royal Counties Agricultural Society's Exhibition in the Home Park, Windsor, and spending a day or two at Claremont, leaves on the 11th for Osborne.

On Monday night the Prince and Princess of Wales were present at a promenade held in the International Exhibition. Some 5,000 people were present, and the mobbing was less than usual. The prince is said to have been in excellent health and spirits.

The national memorial to the Prince Consort, erected in Hyde Park, was on Tuesday visited by the Queen, the Duke of Edinburgh, Princess Louise, &c. The proceedings were entirely devoid of ceremonial, and very few persons witnessed Her Majesty's arrival or departure. The monument was subsequently visited by a considerable number of persons invited by the executive committee.

Royalty has again visited the East-end of London in the person of Princess Louise, who, accompanied by the Marquis of Lorne, opened the new home of the North-Eastern Hospital for Children in the Hackney-road. Lord Fitzroy delivered an address, and in the absence of Mr. Samuel Morley, the Rev. W. Tyler thanked the princess, dwelling on the deficiency of accommodation for the suffering poor of the East-end.

On Tuesday the Prince and Princess of Wales gave a grand garden party at Chiswick.

Mr. J. Gilbert Scott, the architect for the Prince Consort's national memorial in Hyde Park, is to receive the honour of knighthood.

By command of the Queen, a State ball was given last evening at Buckingham Palace, to which a party of 1,900 was invited.

The Emperor Napoleon is suffering from an attack of gout.

On Thursday last, the marriage of Miss Fox, Lady Holland's adopted daughter, to Prince Lichtenstein, celebrated by Dr. Manning at the "Pro-Cathedral," Kensington, created much stir in fashionable circles, and was well reported in the daily papers. The bride was given away by Earl Granville, and the Prince and Princess of Wales and other members of the royal family were present at the ceremony.

There has been a grand State concert at Buckingham Palace.

Sir Roundell Palmer, M.P., has returned from Geneva.

The builders' lock-out in London continues, though in operation to only a partial extent. The masters are endeavouring to secure the co-operation of their class throughout the country in resisting the demands of the men; and it is said that steps are about to be taken in the provinces for reducing the number of workmen contributing to the strike funds. The men still decline all arbitration. The masters' committee, however, have expressed their willingness to refer the questions at issue to such a tribunal as that proposed by the committee of the Social Science Association.

At a meeting of the Dublin Corporation on Monday the house was counted out to escape a vote on Alderman MacSwiney's proposed resolution of censure on Mr. Justice Keogh.

A man named Taylor, a dealer in old metals, in Bermondsey, killed a woman with whom he was living, by beating in her skull, and also murdered their child, a girl five years of age, besides maiming a son, aged thirteen, so frightfully that his life is despaired of. He then cut his own throat, severing the windpipe, and was conveyed to Guy's Hospital. He is in a dying state.

Yesterday the International Prison Congress opened in the hall of the Middle Temple. The Earl of Carnarvon delivered the opening address.

Lord Milton has resigned his seat in Parliament. The South-West Riding Liberal Registration Association has resolved not to contest the division at the present time, but to reserve its strength for a contest for both seats at the general election. Mr. Stanhope, the Conservative, will, therefore, be returned unopposed.

Major Bolton has reported to the Board of Trade that the cause of the short supply of water at Bermondsey is a deficiency of reservoirs for storage. This is about to be remedied by the water company, who are to have two large reservoirs built at Nunhead.

The *Alliance News* states that the petitions presented up to June 21, in support of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill, numbered 6,266, bearing 1,346,363 signatures.

At the annual meeting of the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Working Classes, the Earl of Shaftesbury in the chair, the Right Hon. W. Cowper-Temple, M.P., dwelt strongly on the necessity of the labourer being better housed, and strongly urged the assistance of the wealthier classes towards effecting an improvement in this direction. The real property belonging to the society was estimated as worth 35,442*l.*, and the liabilities were 20,573*l.*

Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton has been selected, at a meeting of the Liberal party in Westminster, as a candidate for that city upon the occurrence of a vacancy.

On Thursday Mr. Bruce received a deputation, representing the interests of the overworked milliners and dressmakers, whose members complained of the long hours which are the rule in most of the establishments. The Home Secretary promised to give the subject his best attention, adding that he would gladly receive any suggestion or information bearing upon the matter.

It appears from the official declaration that Mr. Bassett, the Liberal, who is a member of the Society of Friends, though opposed to disestablishment, was returned by a majority of 200 for Bedfordshire, the numbers being—Mr. Bassett, 2450 Colonel Stuart, 2250.

The Rev. G. C. Swayne, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, has resigned holy orders in consequence of the Bennett judgment.

It has been proposed that Mr. Bennett's friends should show thankfulness for the recent judgment by raising 5000*l.* to defray the cost of the restoration of his church at Frome.

The select committee of the House of Commons, appointed on the motion of Mr. Dalrymple, has come to a unanimous decision in favour of establishing reformatories for inebriates of the middle and upper classes. They are of opinion that persons may be admitted by voluntary application, or by order of a court of inquiry, or committed by magistrates in petty session for a fixed period. They recommend that power be given to detain in such asylums those who are admitted. Stringent restrictions and inspection of the reformatories will be provided, with other important collateral recommendations.

The British Australian Telegraph Company Limited announce that telegrams for Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand will be sent at 10*l.* for twenty words; but at the senders' risk till the land line is completed. It seems, however, that there is some fault in the submarine cable between Java and Port Darwin, and that there can, for the present, be no communication.

A congratulatory address has been sent to the Pope, signed by the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Bute, Lords Denbigh, Robert Montagu, Petre, the Master of Lovat, and other noblemen. The address congratulates His Holiness on once more celebrating the anniversary of his accession to the Pontifical Throne. Victor Emmanuel's presence in Rome is declared to be "an unjust and sacrilegious usurpation."

Miscellaneous.

SOCIETY OF ARTS MUSIC EXAMINATIONS.—The newly-issued results of this year's examinations in musical theory and composition, under Messrs. Hullah and G. A. Macfarren, show that of the eighty-seven certificates and three prizes awarded by Mr. Hullah, tonic sol-fa pupils have taken the first prize and sixty-eight (more than three-fourths) of the certificates. Mr. Macfarren has awarded two prizes and thirty-six certificates, and solfaists have taken both the prizes and thirty-one of the certificates. The society has now relinquished its musical examinations, in which, during the last six years, 594 certificates have been issued, more than three-quarters (449) having been obtained by tonic sol-fa pupils In Mr. Hullah's examination the ordinary notation and nomenclature of music is strictly used; in Mr. Macfarren's the exercises may be worked in either new or old notation, at the candidate's option. The Council of the Tonic Sol-fa College, having tried in vain to induce the Science and Art Department and the University of London to carry on these examinations, has determined as a provisional measure to undertake the work for three years at least.

M. GUIZOT AND THE FRENCH PROTESTANT SYNOD.—M. Guizot has sent the following letter to the Protestant Synod in sending in his resignation as a member of that body:—

The fatigue which I feel does not permit me any longer to take part in the sittings and general discussions of the General Synod. It is not at eighty-four years of age that after the labour of each day a little rest in the evening is sufficient. I return thanks to God for having permitted me, so near the close of my life, to be called to testify my firm attachment to the Christian faith and my confidence in the General Synod and the Reformed Church of France. I thank my colleagues, members of this august assembly, for the kindness with which they have received my free language. I respect their liberty as much as my own, even when their belief differs from mine, and I pray to God to pour His light on all their thoughts and resolutions in the work of Christian charity with which they are charged, and which inspires in all Christendom, in despite of the disputes which divide it, so great and legitimate an interest, &c. (Signed) GUIZOT.

The synod has refused to elect its members by universal suffrage. Yesterday there was an animated debate on a proposal of the orthodox majority providing for private synods to supervise the celebration of public worship, the teaching of doctrine, and the ordering of ecclesiastical affairs. The Liberals demanded, "What doctrine?" to which M. Baurigaut replied, "The doctrine enunciated in the profession of faith already voted." M. Athanase Coquerel said the Liberals defended the Reformed Church against the revolutionary innovations of the orthodox party, who wished to go backwards. The Liberals upheld the modern progress which had been accomplished. He described the proposed control by private synods as a police system. The synod finally rejected all amendments, and voted the proposal of the orthodox party.

STAR DRIFTING.—At the last meeting of the Astronomical Society, Dr. Huggins, the eminent spectroscopist, made an extraordinary statement respecting the motions taking place among the stars. He was able to announce with some degree of confidence that Sirius is receding at a rate exceeding twenty miles per second. In order that he might extend the method to other stars, the Royal Society placed at his disposal a fine telescope fifteen inches in aperture, and specially adapted to gather as much light as possible with that aperture. Suitable spectroscopic appliances were also provided for the delicate work Dr. Huggins was to undertake. It was but last winter that the instrument was ready for work; but already Dr. Huggins has obtained the most wonderful news from the stars with its aid. He finds that many of the stars are travelling far more swiftly than had been supposed. Arcturus, for example, is travelling towards us at a rate of some fifty miles per second, and as his thwart-motion is fully as great (for this star's distance has been estimated), the actual velocity with which he is speeding through space cannot be less than seventy miles per second. Other stars are moving with corresponding velocities. It had been asserted more than two years ago that certain five stars of the Plough or Charles's Wain—the stars known to astronomers as Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, and Zeta of the Great Bear—are drifting bodily through space. The announcement seemed to many very daring, yet its author (trusting in the mathematical analysis of the evidence) expressed unquestioning confidence; he asserted, moreover, that whenever Dr. Huggins applied the new method of research he would find that those five stars are either all approaching or all receding, and at the same rate, from the earth. The result has justified his confidence as well in his theory as in Dr. Huggins's mastery of the new method. Those five stars are found to be all receding from the earth at the rate of about thirty miles per second.—*Spectator.*

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

[A uniform charge of One Shilling (prepaid) is made for announcements under this heading, for which postage-stamps will be received. All such announcements must be authenticated by the name and address of the sender.]

BIRTH.

MORGAN.—June 26, at Afton House, Turnham Green, Chiswick, the wife of the Rev. E. Morgan, of a son, still-born.

MARRIAGES.

GOADBY—WOODHOUSE.—June 20, at Mansfield-road Chapel, Nottingham, by the Rev. Samuel Cox, assisted by the Rev. E. Goadby, B.A., of Derby, the Rev. Frederic W. Goadby, M.A., minister of the Baptist Chapel, Bluntisham, Hunts, to Elizabeth, third daughter of Mr. Thomas Woodhouse, of Nottingham.

HARGROVE—CHRISTIAN.—June 25, at the Parish Church, Hampstead, by the Rev. C. D. Bell, assisted by the Rev. C. H. Waller, the Rev. Joseph Hargrove, youngest son of the late Rev. Charles Hargrove, to Eleanor Katharine, eldest daughter of Ewan Christian, of Hampstead and Whitehall-place.

ANDREWES—BOORNE.—July 2, at Trinity Chapel, Reading, by the Rev. J. F. Stevenson, LL.B., Charles Henry Andrewes, of No. 2, Belsize-terrace, Hampstead, eldest son of Mr. Alderman Andrewes, J.P., of Reading, to Mary Ellen, eldest daughter of James Boorne, of Sydenham House, Reading.

DEATHS.

ABBS.—June 25, Louisa Sewell, the beloved wife of the Rev. John Abbs, Kirby Moorside, formerly missionary in South Travancore, India, aged 62.

LEASK.—June 25, killed by falling over a cliff at Margate, George, son of the Rev. Dr. Leask, of Maberly Chapel, Kingsland, London, aged 21.

SADDINGTON.—June 27, at 23, Arundel-square, Samuel Saddington, after a very brief illness, in his 72nd year, deeply lamented by a large circle of friends.

NOTICE.—The clergy and gentry are respectfully informed that Messrs. Dollond have removed from 59, St. Paul's Churchyard, to No. 1, Ludgate-hill, where Spectacles and Eyeglasses may be had to suit every peculiarity of sight. —Trial glasses sent to any part of the kingdom carriage free. No Travellers employed. Established 1750.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.—This celebrated and most delicious old mellow spirit is the very cream of Irish Whiskies, in quality unrivalled, perfectly pure, and more wholesome than the finest Cognac Brandy. Note the words "Kinahan's LL," on seal, label and cork. Wholesale Depot, 6A, Great Titchfield-street, Oxford-street, W.

The following Liberal members (22), who were absent last year, voted for the motion this year :—

Blennerhassett, R. (new)	Lawrence, Sir J. C.	Samuelson, H. B.
Brogden, A.	Lawrence, W.	Sartoris, E. J.
Chadwick, D.	Macfie, R. A.	Smyth, D. J. (new)
Clifford, C. C.	Mackintosh, E. W.	Torrens, R. R.
Herbert, Hon. A.	Maguire, J. F.	Villiers, C. P.
Kensington, Lord	Marling, S. S.	Weguelin, T.
Kinnaird, Hon. A.	Palmer, J. H.	Willyams, E. W. B.
	Plimsoll, S.	

The following Liberal members (6), who voted against the motion of last year, voted in favour of the recent motion :—

Adair, H. E.	Grieve, J. J.	Johnston, A.
Bazley, T.	Holms, J.	Russell, Lord A.

Sixty-six members repeated their votes.

Of the members who supported the motion, either by voting or pairing, there were :—

This year.		Last year.	
English	67	English	58
Scotch	11	Scotch	13
Irish	10	Irish	10
Welsh	12	Welsh	10
Metropolitan	8	Metropolitan	5
	108		96

Of the Liberal members who voted against the motion there were :—

This year.		Last year.	
English	71	English	89
Scotch	9	Scotch	18
Irish	9	Irish	12
Welsh	4	Welsh	6
Metropolitan	3	Metropolitan	9
	96		134

The following are some results of an analysis of the divisions in the two years :—

In 1871 there voted for the motion 89. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 5. Total supporters, 96.

In 1872 there voted for the motion 94. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 12. Total supporters, 108.

In 1871 there voted against the motion 374. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 5. Total opponents, 381.

In 1872 there voted against the motion 295. Tellers, 2. Pairs, 12. Total opponents, 307.

It is curious to notice that 96 Liberals voted for the motion of 1872, which was the exact number, including pairs, that supported it in 1871.

In 1871 no fewer than 146 Liberals absented themselves unpaired ; this year, as will be seen, that number has been increased to 160.

Last year the majority against the motion was composed of 134 Liberals, 242 Conservatives.

This year the majority was composed of 96 Liberals and 199 Conservatives.

In support of Mr. Hughes's amendment there were 43 Liberals, of whom 14 voted against Mr. Miall, while 3 who were absent on Mr. Miall's division voted with Mr. Hughes.

PAIRS.

For.	Against.
Mr. Stevenson	Colonel Jervis.
Mr. Crum-Ewing	Mr. Matheson.
Mr. J. B. Smith	Colonel Gray.
Mr. Dalglish	Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Pease	Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen.
Colonel Roden	Mr. Peek.
Capt. Stacpoole	Mr. Meyrick.
Mr. Whitworth	Mr. Bourke.
Mr. Backhouse	Sir R. Anstruther.
Mr. T. B. Potter	Sir G. Jenkinson.
Mr. G. Onslow	Mr. Floyer.

Mr. J. D. Lewis, in consequence of indisposition preventing him from staying for the division, paired in favour of Mr. Miall's motion with Mr. O'Reilly Dease against.

It is stated in the *Times* that Mr. Holms, having misapprehended the purport of the question put on Mr. Miall's motion, voted with him instead of against him.

THE PRESS ON MR. MIALL'S MOTION.

The *Times*, assuming that Mr. Miall admits that there is no popular feeling in favour of disestablishment, and asserting that the nation is sensible of no grievance in the existing position of the Church, and scarcely betrays any interest in the assaults made upon it, thinks that the hon. member is put out of court as a practical adviser. The Irish case confirms this view by force of contrast. It would be sheer waste of legislative power and of deliberative energy to entertain proposals thus based on no public demand or popular necessity. When our institutions are found to work ill it is quite time enough to think of pulling them up by the roots, and even then common wisdom would suggest an attempt to reform them with as little destruction as possible. Mr. Miall wants information which, as he conceives, will justify his demand for disestablishment. But again he betrays the same inability to look at his subject from a practical point of view. He asks for a Royal Commission. If the Dissenters would pledge themselves to abstain from any further agitation until such a commission had made a full and accurate report on all these points, the friends of the Church would do well to procure its instant appointment. Doomsday itself would be likely to arrive before any ecclesiastical Doomsday Book would provide accurate particulars respecting the origin of revenues dating back to Saxon times. But, even if such information could be obtained, what would be its practical value? The question is by what right and on what conditions the property is held now, not on what terms it was given in an obscure antiquity. As Mr. Gladstone urged, a minute knowledge of these details is totally unnecessary for any practical purpose Mr. Miall has in view. Quite enough is known of the revenues of the Church to afford material for a *prima facie* case, either for or against it ; and if Mr. Miall cannot convert the people to his views by the facts already at his disposal, he certainly would not be any more successful with the aid of a royal commission. As far as the moral and spiritual welfare of the country is concerned, nothing is more to be deprecated than that the attention of the clergy should be diverted from their ministerial duties to the excitement of a political struggle for existence.

Already a mischievous association for Church defence has been called into existence, and the time of the clergy is greatly wasted in discussing new schemes of organisation. The best defence for the Church is patient practical work in elevating the moral and spiritual character of the people. Its dangers are internal, and lie in the extravagancies of its extreme sections. If the friends of the Church are wise, they will devote all their influence to controlling and moderating the various movements within her pale, and extending her means of usefulness.

Writing on Tuesday (before the debate) the *Daily News* denies that the Anglican Establishment is national in character as well as in name. It is the Church of the English State, but it does not even claim to be the Church of the whole English people. It is the largest, the oldest, the wealthiest, the most popular, the most powerful, the most comprehensive of all the sects into which English Protestantism is divided ; but it is a sect, and as such it cannot permanently occupy the position of a national Church. How is this fact to be dealt with? To make the Church really national might have been done before the Act of Uniformity which laid the foundation of religious disunion, but not now :—

Could the Established Church be made to include the wide diversity of religious thought which exists among us? Can we imagine Mr. Bennett and Mr. Voysey ; Canon Liddon and Mr. Martineau ; Dr. Allon and Dean Stanley ; Bishop Colenso and Dr. Rigg, forming part of the same ecclesiastical organisation, and working together as integral parts of one national institution? It is, indeed, possible to imagine it, but hardly possible to fit it in with the actual world. It is Utopia ; a Utopia, however, which is not all a dream. Everybody feels its fascination. When it is expounded by such writers as the Dean of Westminster, it is impossible not to wish it were possible. A Church which should be as large as the nation's thought, as comprehensive as the nation's religion, would be national indeed. But how can such a state of things be brought about? Lord Shaftesbury finds a wide response among laymen to a suggestion for the modification of a clause in a creed or a direction in a rubric ; but what say the ecclesiastical powers? Convocation will not touch it. Parliament dares not meddle, since there is no knowing where meddling will end. At such a time, to be talking of a National Church, made really national by a wide comprehension which shall give room to all forms of the nation's faith, is to waste valuable time. The problem is incapable of this solution, which nowhere really comes in contact with practical statesmanship.

The eventual triumph of the policy which Mr. Miall represents appears certain. We shall be driven to the policy of levelling down—a policy that has lost its terrors even for the clerical mind—since the Irish Church came so triumphantly through the process—

It will probably be done some day by general consent. The policy of comprehension is one of the possibilities of the past ; that of disestablishment has become the certainty of the future. The whole tendency of politics is to the entire severance of the two spheres of the State and the Church. This has been curiously illustrated in the education controversy. The vast majority of English society are agreed that education, to be complete, must include instruction in religion ; yet the whole movement which the Education Act has started is one for excluding the State from all interference with religious teaching. The parental idea of Government is exploded. The modern theory of the State is that it is a secular organisation for secular ends. This conception may not be complete, but it is the conception which really influences practical affairs. It has so complete possession of the public mind, that all our legislation will have to be brought into harmony with it.

Mr. Miall is therefore on the winning side.

The *Daily Telegraph* says that the union of Church and State is a fact involving a great principle, warmly defended by its friends and assailed by its enemies with intense animosity. "It is new to us that this contention on the high ground of principle can be affected by tables of figures, columns of statistics, bushels of hard facts. A statesman proposing to preserve and reform the Church, to reorganise its administration, and to redistribute its revenues, might usefully take up Mr. Miall's motion without his motive, and make it the basis of a grand bill. But we greatly fear that the time is hardly favourable for such a gigantic task." The *Telegraph*, though admitting that the Church does not comprise the whole of the English people, denies that it is not national. Its clergy are in every parish, the Church Liturgy is everywhere used—by the bedside of the friendless pauper, and in the chapel of the Queen. In some parishes the clergy do everything, and are frequently the solitary link between the destitute poor and the rich. If the Church is disestablished and disendowed, how is the gap to be filled in the rural parishes? It would be reversing the policy of the Education Act, if, by disestablishing the Church, we proclaimed our indifference to that educational process which always goes on in some shape or another where a number of men, women, and children are brought under the sway of lofty ideas expounded, even if only once a week, by an educated man. Every church closed by Mr. Miall would simply be a school shut up. Possibly the artists of the future may one day bless the memory of Mr. Miall, whose action against the Establishment would indirectly lead to the multiplication over England of picturesque ecclesiastical ruins. The *Telegraph* thinks that the true policy is to use our State power so as to make the wealth of the Church subserve, as far as possible, national ends.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* says that Mr. Miall's motion itself was a model of moderation, and his speech in its essence as Conservative and generally respectable, as if it had been delivered by an archbishop. Altogether, the debate was one which may be safely recommended to the notice of any person who fears that matters will go too quick in this country, and that we may find ourselves some day without notice in the middle of a revolution. But the motion was useless with a view to stop the spoliation cry—

People who talk about our pious forefathers, confiscation, the identity of the title to Church lands and the title to private property, and the rest of it, do not found their opinions on laborious inquiries into matters of fact, and would not surrender them if they were led to believe that certain huge folio volumes contained clear proof that in remote times tithes and other endowments were settled on the clergy by law and not by private benevolence.

The general result of the debate is, the *Pall Mall* thinks, to show that for the present, at least—using the word present so as to include probably the lifetime of the existing generation—the Church of England has nothing to fear from external attacks. What it may have to fear from internal causes is another question—

If it is to die, it will die from softening of the brain, and that is a slow and gradual complaint which often leaves the general appearance and the apparent vigour of the limbs and the trunk quite untouched for a great length of time. Some of its first symptoms are stammering, squinting, and unnatural stupidity.

The *Post* holds that nothing can be more insincere than the pretence that the interests of the Church are contemplated by Mr. Miall's motion. It is an overt act of the policy which aims at the destruction of the Church, and it asks House of Commons to interfere in a matter on which there is no public demand for its interference, in the hope of stirring up an agitation where no agitation exists.

The *Echo* concludes an article by saying :—

Perhaps, on mature consideration, Churchmen will not feel themselves quite satisfied with their numerical victory. It was too complete to be permanent. They have armed Mr. Miall with a distinct grievance with which to go to the country and to fan that agitation to which Mr. Gladstone invites him. He is not the person to neglect his opportunity. An excellent motion failed, we may say, in conclusion, because it came from Mr. Miall ; and no one suggested that that objectionable feature might have been removed, and that the Nonconformist motion might have been made a Church motion, by all Churchmen hastening to adopt it. If it was improper solely because it came from the editor of the *Nonconformist*, why did it not come from Mr. Gladstone?

The *Examiner* of last Saturday in an anticipatory article says that Mr. Miall's annual motion is based on solid, irrefragable principles, and it must triumph.

Every one acknowledges that, with the prodigious diversity of religious belief prevailing amongst us, there is no platform on which even the majority can meet for any hearty genuine worship. The spectacle presented by the Church of England shutting out Mr. Voysey and keeping in Mr. Bennett is an evidence that, like the image of Nebuchadnezzar, it is composed of too incongruous elements to be able to stand. We believe that the Privy Council is more anxious to preserve the comprehensiveness of the Church than possibly almost any other tribunal that might be set up ; but its failure is egregious, for it can only keep up the semblance of agreement in the Church by a sophistical treatment of language, which, if it were not honestly intended, would deserve to be called Jesuitical.

The *Examiner* expresses a confident belief that long before Mr. Miall's motion is carried the Established Church of Scotland will be numbered among the things of the past.

The signal has been given ; the great Assemblies of the Dissenting Churches have thrown down the gauntlet ; and the existence of the "Auld Kirk" may be regarded as not only menaced, but as already on the eve of destruction. The assailants in Scotland of the Established Church have put in the foreground of the battle the latitudinarianism and doctrinal unsoundness of the Established Church. The Free Church Assembly and the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church know the worth of a good cry, and they are quite aware that if the issue of orthodoxy and heterodoxy were left to the people of Scotland, the Established Church could not live a year. We shall see that the defenders of the Established Church will appeal to the ancient purity of its doctrines, and maintain the inflexible rigidity of its faith. . . . With the Dissenters in arms, we are at a loss to perceive where the Kirk can find succour. It has now formally asked Parliament to abolish patronage, the only badge by which it could distinguish itself from Dissent ; and, as it thus makes itself one in practice with the other Presbyterian Churches, it cannot claim the special privilege of endowment. Its fate cannot, therefore, be long delayed. Its boldest advocates do not pretend that more than 48 per cent. of the population adhere to the Established Church ; and even this figure can only be made out by reckoning as members of the "Kirk" all that are connected with any other religious denomination. We doubt if even thirty-six out of 100 could be relied upon to support the Establishment ; and if this be so, its fate at the ballot-box is easily predicted. When that is over, we shall have some prospect of a successful issue to Mr. Miall's motion.

After arguing that the ideal Church of the future, according to the views of comprehensionists—one which would embrace all sects—is visionary, because it would raise up perplexing and insoluble

problems, and involve concurrent endowment, the true issue is whether it is just that property belonging to the whole nation should be given up for the maintenance of one among many sects.

So long as the Church of England exists, the sovereign power—the electors—by implication asserts that the best use to which her revenues can be put is to maintain the sect introduced in Henry VIII.'s reign and consolidated by Elizabeth. Does the Church of England perform such inestimable service, beyond all other Churches, that while they are sent empty away from the Exchequer her coffers should be duly replenished? Put in another way, the question is whether a fraction, be it large or small, of the population should at the public expense be provided with religious services, while their neighbours must pay out of their own pockets for inferior accommodation. When we remember that the persons who may thus be described as spiritual paupers are the richest, and of all classes can best afford to pay for the ministrations of religion, there can be no hesitation in declaring the injustice and excessive unfairness of the present arrangement.

Epitome of News.

Her Majesty, who has been visiting the Royal Counties Agricultural Society's Exhibition in the Home Park, Windsor, and spending a day or two at Claremont, leaves on the 11th for Osborne.

On Monday night the Prince and Princess of Wales were present at a promenade held in the International Exhibition. Some 5,000 people were present, and the mobbing was less than usual. The prince is said to have been in excellent health and spirits.

The national memorial to the Prince Consort, erected in Hyde Park, was on Tuesday visited by the Queen, the Duke of Edinburgh, Princess Louise, &c. The proceedings were entirely devoid of ceremonial, and very few persons witnessed Her Majesty's arrival or departure. The monument was subsequently visited by a considerable number of persons invited by the executive committee.

Royalty has again visited the East-end of London in the person of Princess Louise, who, accompanied by the Marquis of Lorne, opened the new home of the North-Eastern Hospital for Children in the Hackney-road. Lord Fitzroy delivered an address, and in the absence of Mr. Samuel Morley, the Rev. W. Tyler thanked the princess, dwelling on the deficiency of accommodation for the suffering poor of the East-end.

On Tuesday the Prince and Princess of Wales gave a grand garden party at Chiswick.

Mr. J. Gilbert Scott, the architect for the Prince Consort's national memorial in Hyde Park, is to receive the honour of knighthood.

By command of the Queen, a State ball was given last evening at Buckingham Palace, to which a party of 1,900 was invited.

The Emperor Napoleon is suffering from an attack of gout.

On Thursday last, the marriage of Miss Fox, Lady Holland's adopted daughter, to Prince Lichtenstein, celebrated by Dr. Manning at the "Pro-Cathedral," Kensington, created much stir in fashionable circles, and was well reported in the daily papers. The bride was given away by Earl Granville, and the Prince and Princess of Wales and other members of the royal family were present at the ceremony.

There has been a grand State concert at Buckingham Palace.

Sir Roundell Palmer, M.P., has returned from Geneva.

The builders' lock-out in London continues, though in operation to only a partial extent. The masters are endeavouring to secure the co-operation of their class throughout the country in resisting the demands of the men; and it is said that steps are about to be taken in the provinces for reducing the number of workmen contributing to the strike funds. The men still decline all arbitration. The masters' committee, however, have expressed their willingness to refer the questions at issue to such a tribunal as that proposed by the committee of the Social Science Association.

At a meeting of the Dublin Corporation on Monday the house was counted out to escape a vote on Alderman MacSwiney's proposed resolution of censure on Mr. Justice Keogh.

A man named Taylor, a dealer in old metals, in Bermondsey, killed a woman with whom he was living, by beating in her skull, and also murdered their child, a girl five years of age, besides maiming a son, aged thirteen, so frightfully that his life is despaired of. He then cut his own throat, severing the windpipe, and was conveyed to Guy's Hospital. He is in a dying state.

Yesterday the International Prison Congress opened in the hall of the Middle Temple. The Earl of Carnarvon delivered the opening address.

Lord Milton has resigned his seat in Parliament. The South-West Riding Liberal Registration Association has resolved not to contest the division at the present time, but to reserve its strength for a contest for both seats at the general election. Mr. Stanhope, the Conservative, will, therefore, be returned unopposed.

Major Bolton has reported to the Board of Trade that the cause of the short supply of water at Bermondsey is a deficiency of reservoirs for storage. This is about to be remedied by the water company, who are to have two large reservoirs built at Nunhead.

The *Alliance News* states that the petitions presented up to June 21, in support of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill, numbered 6,266, bearing 1,346,363 signatures.

At the annual meeting of the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Working Classes, the Earl of Shaftesbury in the chair, the Right Hon. W. Cowper-Temple, M.P., dwelt strongly on the necessity of the labourer being better housed, and strongly urged the assistance of the wealthier classes towards effecting an improvement in this direction. The real property belonging to the society was estimated as worth 35,442*l.*, and the liabilities were 20,573*l.*

Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton has been selected, at a meeting of the Liberal party in Westminster, as a candidate for that city upon the occurrence of a vacancy.

On Thursday Mr. Bruce received a deputation, representing the interests of the overworked milliners and dressmakers, whose members complained of the long hours which are the rule in most of the establishments. The Home Secretary promised to give the subject his best attention, adding that he would gladly receive any suggestion or information bearing upon the matter.

It appears from the official declaration that Mr. Bassett, the Liberal, who is a member of the Society of Friends, though opposed to disestablishment, was returned by a majority of 200 for Bedfordshire, the numbers being—Mr. Bassett, 2450 Colonel Stuart, 2250.

The Rev. G. C. Swayne, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, has resigned holy orders in consequence of the Bennett judgment.

It has been proposed that Mr. Bennett's friends should show thankfulness for the recent judgment by raising 5000*l.* to defray the cost of the restoration of his church at Frome.

The select committee of the House of Commons, appointed on the motion of Mr. Dalrymple, has come to a unanimous decision in favour of establishing reformatories for inebriates of the middle and upper classes. They are of opinion that persons may be admitted by voluntary application, or by order of a court of inquiry, or committed by magistrates in petty session for a fixed period. They recommend that power be given to detain in such asylums those who are admitted. Stringent restrictions and inspection of the reformatories will be provided, with other important collateral recommendations.

The British Australian Telegraph Company Limited announce that telegrams for Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand will be sent at 10*l.* for twenty words; but at the senders' risk till the land line is completed. It seems, however, that there is some fault in the submarine cable between Java and Port Darwin, and that there can, for the present, be no communication.

A congratulatory address has been sent to the Pope, signed by the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Bute, Lords Denbigh, Robert Montagu, Petre, the Master of Lovat, and other noblemen. The address congratulates His Holiness on once more celebrating the anniversary of his accession to the Pontifical Throne. Victor Emmanuel's presence in Rome is declared to be "an unjust and sacrilegious usurpation."

Miscellaneous.

SOCIETY OF ARTS MUSIC EXAMINATIONS.—The newly-issued results of this year's examinations in musical theory and composition, under Messrs. Hullah and G. A. Macfarren, show that of the eighty-seven certificates and three prizes awarded by Mr. Hullah, tonic sol-fa pupils have taken the first prize and sixty-eight (more than three-fourths) of the certificates. Mr. Macfarren has awarded two prizes and thirty-six certificates, and solfaists have taken both the prizes and thirty-one of the certificates. The society has now relinquished its musical examinations, in which, during the last six years, 594 certificates have been issued, more than three-quarters (449) having been obtained by tonic sol-fa pupils In Mr. Hullah's examination the ordinary notation and nomenclature of music is strictly used; in Mr. Macfarren's the exercises may be worked in either new or old notation, at the candidate's option. The Council of the Tonic Sol-fa College, having tried in vain to induce the Science and Art Department and the University of London to carry on these examinations, has determined as a provisional measure to undertake the work for three years at least.

M. GUIZOT AND THE FRENCH PROTESTANT SYNOD.—M. Guizot has sent the following letter to the Protestant Synod in sending in his resignation as a member of that body:—

The fatigue which I feel does not permit me any longer to take part in the sittings and general discussions of the General Synod. It is not at eighty-four years of age that after the labour of each day a little rest in the evening is sufficient. I return thanks to God for having permitted me, so near the close of my life, to be called to testify my firm attachment to the Christian faith and my confidence in the General Synod and the Reformed Church of France. I thank my colleagues, members of this august assembly, for the kindness with which they have received my free language. I respect their liberty as much as my own, even when their belief differs from mine, and I pray to God to pour His light on all their thoughts and resolutions in the work of Christian charity with which they are charged, and which inspires in all Christendom, in despite of the disputes which divide it, so great and legitimate an interest, &c. (Signed) GUIZOT.

The synod has refused to elect its members by universal suffrage. Yesterday there was an animated debate on a proposal of the orthodox majority providing for private synods to supervise the celebration of public worship, the teaching of doctrine, and the ordering of ecclesiastical affairs. The Liberals demanded, "What doctrine?" to which M. Baurigaut replied, "The doctrine enunciated in the profession of faith already voted." M. Athanase Coquerel said the Liberals defended the Reformed Church against the revolutionary innovations of the orthodox party, who wished to go backwards. The Liberals upheld the modern progress which had been accomplished. He described the proposed control by private synods as a police system. The synod finally rejected all amendments, and voted the proposal of the orthodox party.

STAR DRIFTING.—At the last meeting of the Astronomical Society, Dr. Huggins, the eminent spectroscopist, made an extraordinary statement respecting the motions taking place among the stars. He was able to announce with some degree of confidence that Sirius is receding at a rate exceeding twenty miles per second. In order that he might extend the method to other stars, the Royal Society placed at his disposal a fine telescope fifteen inches in aperture, and specially adapted to gather as much light as possible with that aperture. Suitable spectroscopic appliances were also provided for the delicate work Dr. Huggins was to undertake. It was but last winter that the instrument was ready for work; but already Dr. Huggins has obtained the most wonderful news from the stars with its aid. He finds that many of the stars are travelling far more swiftly than had been supposed. Arcturus, for example, is travelling towards us at a rate of some fifty miles per second, and as his thwart-motion is fully as great (for this star's distance has been estimated), the actual velocity with which he is speeding through space cannot be less than seventy miles per second. Other stars are moving with corresponding velocities. It had been asserted more than two years ago that certain five stars of the Plough or Charles's Wain—the stars known to astronomers as Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, and Zeta of the Great Bear—are drifting bodily through space. The announcement seemed to many very daring, yet its author (trusting in the mathematical analysis of the evidence) expressed unquestioning confidence; he asserted, moreover, that whenever Dr. Huggins applied the new method of research he would find that those five stars are either all approaching or all receding, and at the same rate, from the earth. The result has justified his confidence as well in his theory as in Dr. Huggins's mastery of the new method. Those five stars are found to be all receding from the earth at the rate of about thirty miles per second.—*Spectator.*

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

[A uniform charge of One Shilling (prepaid) is made for announcements under this heading, for which postage-stamps will be received. All such announcements must be authenticated by the name and address of the sender.]

BIRTH.

MORGAN.—June 26, at Afton House, Turnham Green, Chiswick, the wife of the Rev. E. Morgan, of a son, still-born.

MARRIAGES.

GOADBY—WOODHOUSE.—June 20, at Mansfield-road Chapel, Nottingham, by the Rev. Samuel Cox, assisted by the Rev. E. Goadby, B.A., of Derby, the Rev. Frederic W. Goadby, M.A., minister of the Baptist Chapel, Bluntisham, Hunts, to Elizabeth, third daughter of Mr. Thomas Woodhouse, of Nottingham.

HARGROVE—CHRISTIAN.—June 25, at the Parish Church, Hampstead, by the Rev. C. D. Bell, assisted by the Rev. C. H. Waller, the Rev. Joseph Hargrove, youngest son of the late Rev. Charles Hargrove, to Eleanor Katharine, eldest daughter of Ewan Christian, of Hampstead and Whitehall-place.

ANDREWES—BOORNE.—July 2, at Trinity Chapel, Reading, by the Rev. J. F. Stevenson, LL.B., Charles Henry Andrewes, of No. 2, Belsize-terrace, Hampstead, eldest son of Mr. Alderman Andrewes, J.P., of Reading, to Mary Ellen, eldest daughter of James Boorne, of Sydenham House, Reading.

DEATHS.

ABBS.—June 25, Louisa Sewell, the beloved wife of the Rev. John Abbs, Kirby Moorside, formerly missionary in South Travancore, India, aged 62.

LEASK.—June 25, killed by falling over a cliff at Margate, George, son of the Rev. Dr. Leask, of Maberly Chapel, Kingsland, London, aged 21.

SADDINGTON.—June 27, at 23, Arundel-square, Samuel Saddington, after a very brief illness, in his 72nd year, deeply lamented by a large circle of friends.

NOTICE.—The clergy and gentry are respectfully informed that Messrs. Dollond have removed from 59, St. Paul's Churchyard, to No. 1, Ludgate-hill, where Spectacles and Eyeglasses may be had to suit every peculiarity of sight.—Trial glasses sent to any part of the kingdom carriage free. No Travellers employed. Established 1750.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.—This celebrated and most delicious old mellow spirit is the very cream of Irish Whiskies, in quality unrivalled, perfectly pure, and more wholesome than the finest Cognac Brandy. Note the words "Kinahan's LL," on seal, label and cork. Wholesale Depot, 6A, Great Titchfield-street, Oxford-street, W.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

(From Wednesday's *Gazette*.)

An Account, pursuant to the Act 7th and 8th Victoria, cap. 32, for the week ending on Wednesday, June 26.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT.

Notes issued	£38,962,015	Government Debt	£11,015,100
		Other Securities ..	3,984,900
		Gold Coin & Bullion	23,962,015
		Silver Bullion	
	£38,962,015		£38,962,015

BANKING DEPARTMENT.

Prop'tor's Capit'l	£14,553,000	Government Securities, (inc. dead weight annuity)	£13,500,052
Rest..... ..	3,171,068		
Public Deposits ..	13,627,109	Other Securities ..	21,274,406
Other Deposits ..	17,853,108	Notes	13,748,490
Seven Day and other Bills	362,972	Gold & Silver Coin	590,304
	£49,113,252		£49,113,252

June 27, 1872. Geo. Forbes, Chief Cashier.

Markets.

CORN EXCHANGE, Mark Lane, Monday, July 1.

Of English wheat only a small supply was on sale this morning, but from abroad we have fair arrivals. We had an active market, and English wheat made slowly the prices of Monday last. The foreign trade was in retail, and last week's prices were supported. Flour was a dull sale at 1s. per sack reduction. Peas and beans were unchanged in value. Indian corn was in large supply, and prices were about maintained. Barley met a slow sale, at former prices. The arrivals of oats are large, and prices have given way 6d. per qr. since this day week. At the ports of call arrivals have increased, and prices of wheat are 2s. lower. Other descriptions of grain are unchanged in value since this day week.

CURRENT PRICES.

	Per Qr. s.	s.		Per Qr. s.	s.
Wheat—			Peas—		
Essex and Kent, red..	—	to —	Grey	32	to 34
Ditto new.. ..	52	to 60	Maple	36	38
White	—	—	White	36	40
„ new ..	58	65	Boilers	36	40
Foreign red ..	55	57	Foreign	37	40
„ white ..	59	62			
Barley—			Rye—	36	38
English malting	29	32	Oats—		
Chevalier.. ..	36	42	English feed ..	20	25
Distilling.. ..	29	33	„ potato..	25	32
Foreign	23	51	Scotch feed ..	—	—
Malt—			„ potato..	—	—
Pale..	—	—	Irish Black ..	17	20
Chevalier.. ..	—	—	„ White ..	17	21
Brown	51	56	Foreign feed ..	15	17
Beans—			Flour—		
Ticks	32	34	Town made ..	48	54
Harrow	34	36	Best country households ..	41	44
Small	—	—	Norfolk & Suffolk	39	41
Egyptian.. ..	31	32			

BREAD, Monday, July 1.—The prices in the Metropolis are, for Wheaten Bread, per 4lbs. loaf, 7½d. to 8d.; Household Bread, 6½d. to 7d.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET, Monday, July 1.—The total imports of foreign stock into London last week amounted to 9,450 head. In the corresponding week in 1871 we received 15,406; in 1870, 10,208; in 1869, 11,970; and in 1868, 8,419 head. The cattle trade to-day has been characterised by quietness, and prices have in some instances been rather weaker. There has been about an average supply of beasts on sale, including some good Lincolnshire stock. The demand has been less active, and prices have been 2d per 8lbs. lower, the best breeds selling at 5s. 10d. to 6s. per 8lbs. In the foreign supply were noticed some choice Oporto beasts, which were disposed of at prices ranging from 5s. 4d. to 5s. 8d. per 8lbs. From Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, and Northamptonshire we received about 950 Shorthorns, &c.; from Norfolk and Suffolk, 350 Scots and crosses; and from other parts of England 500 various breeds. With sheep the market has been scantily supplied, but the quality has been good. A healthy demand has been experienced, and the best Downs and half-breds have been disposed of at 6s. 4d. to 6s. 6d. per 8lbs. Lambs have been in moderate request, at from 7s. 6d. to 9s. per 8lbs. Calves have been steady and higher in value. Pigs have sold at about late prices.

Per 8lbs., to sink the offal.

	s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.
Inf. coarse beasts	3	2	to 3	6	Prime Southdown	6	4	6	6
Second quality .	3	10	4	6	Lge coarse calves	4	8	5	0
Prime large oxen	5	6	5	6	Prime small .	5	2	5	6
Prime Scots . .	5	10	6	0	Large hogs . .	3	8	4	4
Coarse inf. sheep	4	0	4	8	Neat sm. porkers	4	8	5	0
Second quality .	5	0	5	6	Lamb	7	6	9	0
Pr. coarse woolled	5	8	5	2					

METROPOLITAN MEAT MARKET, Monday, July 1.—There is a moderate supply on offer. The trade is firm, at our quotations.

Per 8lbs. by the carcase.

	s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.
Inferior beef .	3	4	to 4	0	Middling do. .	5	0	to 5	4
Middling do. .	4	2	4	8	Prime do. . .	6	0	6	8
Prime large do.	5	2	5	6	Large pork . .	3	8	4	0
Prime small do.	5	4	5	8	Small do. .	4	8	5	0
Veal	5	0	5	8	Lamb	6	4	7	4
Inferior Mutton	4	4	5	0					

PROVISIONS, Monday, July 1.—The arrivals last week from Ireland were 600 firkins butter and 2,237 bales bacon, and from foreign ports 22,029 packages butter, 1,306 bales bacon. Few transactions passing in Irish butter; the general incorrectness of the tares of the firkins militates against the sale in this market, firkins frequently weighing 2lbs. more than the tare allowed. Foreign butter moves a little better, the weather being cooler. Best Dutch, 92s. to 94; Normandy's finest, 104s. to 106s. per cwt. Bacon has moved more freely, without any material change in prices.

HOPS.—Borough, Monday, July 1.—A quiet tone still pervades our market, prices, however, are tolerably well maintained; Kents are a shade easier in value, but Sussex are firm, being still sought after by shippers. Reports from the plantations are hardly so promising, "fly" still prevails, and the cold, windy weather has prevented the bine from making satisfactory progress. There is no material alteration in the foreign markets. Latest advices from New York quote a fair trade with firm prices, reports from the hop districts being unfavourable. Mid and East Kent, 10*l.* 10s., 12*l.* 12s., to 17*l.*; Weald, 8*l.* 10s., 9*l.* 9s., to 10*l.* 10s.; Sussex, 7*l.* 15s., 8*l.* 8s., to 9*l.* 9s.; Farnham and country, 11*l.* 11s., 13*l.* to 16*l.* Yearlings—Mid and East Kent, 3*l.*, 4*l.* 4s., to 6*l.* 10s.; Weald of Kent, 3*l.*, 4*l.*, to 5*l.* 15s.; Sussex, 3*l.* 5s., 3*l.* 15s., to 5*l.* 12s.; Farnham and country, 6*l.* to 7*l.*; Olds, 1*l.* 5s., 1*l.* 10s. to 2*l.*

SEED, Monday, July 1.—American cloverseeds continue to be asked for, and fine qualities are held steadily for rather more money. There was no inquiry for other sorts, and no change to quote in the value of any. Fine trefoil was held with more firmness, the quantity of such is very limited, but there is plenty of inferior old left yet. White mustardseed was taken off in small lots at fully as much money, but there is no demand for brown, and prices are nominally the same as previously. Good canaryseed was in fair request at fully as much money. Large Dutch hempseed brought a slight advance, such having more buyers. Nothing passed in tares and prices were unchanged.

POTATOES.—Borough and Spitalfields, Monday, July 1.—These markets have been scantily supplied with potatoes. The trade has been quiet as follows—Rocks, 100s. to 110s. per ton; Regents, 110s. to 120s.; Flukes, 120s. to 140s.; Victorias, 140s. to 00s.; new, 8s. to 10s. per cwt.

WOOL, Monday, July 1.—The wool market has been steady in tone. An increased amount of business has been doing in all qualities; but choice descriptions have commanded the larger share of attention.

OIL, Monday, July 1.—The market for linseed oil has been steady, but rape has been neglected. Other oils have been quiet.

TALLOW, Monday, July 1.—Market quiet. Y.C. on the spot, 43s. 6d. per cwt. Town tallow, 41s. net cash.

COAL, Monday, July 1.—Factors succeeded in realising an advance on last day's rates. Hetton's Wallsend, 25s. 6d.; Hetton's South, 25s. 3d.; Hettons Lyons, 23s. 9d.; Hartlepool, original, 25s. 6d.; Hawthorn, 23s. 6d.; Holywell Main, 21s. 6d.; Hartley's, 24s. 6d.; Tees, 25s. 6d.; Wylam East, 24s. 6d. Ships fresh arrived 29, ships at sea 23.

How to Dye Silk, Wool, Feathers, Ribbons, &c., in ten minutes, without soiling the hands. Use Judson's Simple Dyes, eighteen colours, 6d. each, full instructions supplied. Of all chemists. The "Family Herald," Sept. 3, says, "A very slight acquaintance with Judson's Dyes will render their application clear to all."

Holloway's Pills and Ointment.—Physical strength is all essential to health in the present day; a healthy man is a portion of the national wealth; a confirmed invalid a loss to society. Weigh well these words. For the proper development and nourishment of the human body it is essential that the functions of the stomach, liver, kidneys, and bowels be performed with order and regularity. Holloway's remedies readily ensure both. The powers of the stomach are greatly augmented, and good gastric juice secreted in abundance, where this Ointment is diligently rubbed twice a day over the pit of the stomach. The Pills and Ointment enable it to extract all the food's nutritive matter, and to thoroughly digest most articles of diet.

Advertisements.

CHLORALUM. An odourless, non-poisonous disinfectant. The saline antiseptic. Harmless as common salt.

15, Pembroke-road, Dublin,
11th September, 1871.

Sir,—I beg to state that the chloralum powder and solution have been largely employed in this city, and with the most complete success.

The bed of the River Liffey, which emitted a very offensive odour during the recent warm weather, was most satisfactorily disinfected by chloralum powder at the rate of only one pound per 25 square feet.

I have found it most efficacious as a purifier of stables, and I use it constantly in my own house. Altogether, I may say of chloralum that it is a very valuable sanitary agent, and one which is certain to come into general use.

I remain, your obedient servant,
CHAS. A. CAMERON, M.D.,
Professor of Hygiene, Royal College of Surgeons and Analyst of the City of Dublin.

CHLORALUM IS DISINFECTANT.

CHLORALUM IS A SALINE ANTISEPTIC.

CHLORALUM IS ASTRINGENT.

CHLORALUM is sold in quarts, 2s.; pints, 1s.; half-pints, 6d. By the gallon, 5s. In large quantities by special contract at greatly-reduced prices.

CHLORALUM FOR CHOLERA.

CHLORALUM FOR SICK ROOMS.

CHLORALUM POWDER.

CHLORALUM POWDER IS HARMLESS.

CHLORALUM POWDER.—The best stable disinfectant Chloralum Powder will be found invaluable in—

Hospitals	Cowsheds
Close and Ill-Ventilated Apartments	Alleys and Roads
Earth Closets	Sewers and Gulleyholes
Dustbins	In the Dairy and all kinds of Provision Stores
Wine and Beer Cellars	In the Kennel, and in Poultry-houses
Stables	

Chloralum Powder is not caustic or hurtful in any way, and although it absorbs moisture, it does not deteriorate by keeping.

Casks, 1 cwt., for 15s., and in 6d. and 1s. packets.

CHLORALUM WOOL.

CHLORALUM WOOL IN SURGERY.

CHLORALUM WOOL IN HOSPITALS.

CHLORALUM WOOL.—The New Styptic and Antiseptic Surgical Dressing. In pound and half-pound packages, at 6s. per lb.

CHLORALUM WADDING.—CHLORALUM WADDING, in sheets, price 2s. 6d.

Chloralum Wadding is used extensively as a disinfectant in coffins. A dead body, when covered with Chloralum Wool, cannot convey infection.

CHLORALUM IS SOLD BY ALL CHYMISTS.

CHLORALUM CO.:—1 and 2, Great Winchester-street buildings, E.C.

GENERAL SERVANT WANTED, in a Quiet Family, on July 19. Strong and active. Good Character indispensable. Wages, £15, all found. Washing put out. Also a NURSEMAID, from 17 to 20. Both from the Country preferred.—M., 9, Cathcart-hill, Junction-road, Upper Holloway, N.

VENTNOR, ISLE of WIGHT.—Intending Visitors to this locality suited at once with FURNISHED HOUSES or APARTMENTS, by applying to Mr. A. Muggridge, House Agent, Ventnor. Information free of charge. Stamp for reply.

A LADY, Experienced in Tuition, desires a RE-ENGAGEMENT in a family. She is competent to instruct in English, French, Music, Singing, and the rudiments of German. Unexceptionable references.—Address, care of Alfd. Ramsden, Halifax.

A QUALIFIED PHARMACEUTICAL CHEMIST (a Fellow of the Chemical Society), in a fashionable inland watering-place, requires a gentlemanly, well-disposed, intelligent YOUTH as an APPRENTICE. The highest references (including those of former pupils, who have been most successful in their examinations) will be given.

For premium and particulars address F. C. S., care of J. Welman, Esq., Solicitor, 18, Colville-road, London, W.

ORGAN for SALE.—CC to G, 2 complete rows of keys, 17 stops, 2½ oct., pedals and pedal-pipes, splendid quality of tone, 2 reeds in swell. Suitable for Chamber, Chapel, or Church. Very effective. To be sold at a Low Price.

For further particulars apply G. J. T., 67, Bow-lane, Poplar, E.

CONGREGATIONAL SCHOOL, LEWISHAM, for the EDUCATION of the SONS of MINISTERS.

The ANNUAL MEETING of this School will be held at the SCHOOL-HOUSE on Thursday, 11th inst. Chair to be taken at Three P.M., by Rev. THOMAS BINNEY. The Report of the Examination by the Syndicate of Cambridge will be read, Prizes distributed by the Chairman, Recitations delivered by the boys, and Addresses given by various Ministers and other gentlemen.

Tea in the Dining Hall at Six P.M.

JOSIAH VINEY, Hon. Sec.

MORNINGTON CHURCH, HAMPSTEAD-ROAD.

A PUBLIC RELIGIOUS SERVICE, in recognition of the Rev. GEORGE J. PROCTOR as Pastor, will be held on Tuesday Evening, July 9.

The Rev. J. C. HARRISON will preside, and Addresses will be delivered by the Rev. Ll. Bevan, Mark Wilks, Edwd. White, and other ministers.

To Commence at 6·30.

INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, TAUNTON.

Principal—Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH, M.A.
Secretary—Mr. EDWARD BAYLY.

Pupils WILL REASSEMBLE on Friday, August 2nd Prospectuses will be forwarded on application to the Principal or Secretary.

COLLEGE HOUSE SCHOOL, BRAINTREE, ESSEX.

Conducted by the Rev. W. MILNE, M.A., and Sons.

Terms, inclusive, from 30 to 40 Guineas.

School will be RE-OPENED Wednesday, 24th July. Reference permitted to Rev. J. Kennedy, M.A., D.D., London; Rev. W. Leask, D.D., London; Rev. C. Dukes, M.A., London; Rev. A. Goodrich, Braintree; and the Parents of pupils.

MILL HILL SCHOOL, MIDDLESEX,

Head Master—

RICHARD F. WEYMOUTH, Esq., D. Lit. and M.A., Fellow of Univ. Coll., Lond.; Member of the Council of the Philological Society, &c., &c.

Second Master—

J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., M.A., Queen's Coll., Oxford; Double First in Moderations, and 2nd Class in the Final Classical School; also M.A. and late Scholar of Trin. Coll., Camb., 14th in 1st Class in Classical Tripos, and 1st Chancellor's Medallist, 1868.

Assistant Masters—

A. H. SCOTT WHITE, Esq., B.A., Priseman in Anglo-Saxon and Early English of Univ. Coll., London.

JAMES H. MURRAY, Esq., F.E.I.S., Member of the Council of the Philological Society, one of the Editors of the Publications of the Early English Text Society, Author of "The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland," &c., &c.

JAMES NETTLESHIP, Esq., B.A., Scholar and Priseman of Christ's Coll., Camb.; 2nd Class Classical Tripos, 1866.

Resident Lady Matron—Miss COOKE.

The Summer Term commenced on Thursday, 2nd May.

For Prospectuses and further information, apply to the Head Master, at the School, or to the Secretary, the Rev. R. H. MARTEN, B.A., Lee, S.E.

THE NORTHERN CONGREGATIONAL SCHOOL, SILCOATES HOUSE, WAKEFIELD.

Principal—

The Rev. JAMES BEWGLASS, M.A., LL.D., M.R.I.A.

The above School receives, in addition to the Sons of Ministers, a limited number of the Sons of Laymen, who are carefully instructed in all the branches of a sound Classical, Mathematical, and Commercial Education, and are prepared for any department of business, or for entrance at the Universities.

The School will reopen, after the Midsummer Vacation, on Friday, August 2nd, 1872.

Application for the admission of pupils to be addressed to the Principal.

BEDFORDSHIRE MIDDLE CLASS PUBLIC SCHOOL, KEMPSTON, near BEDFORD.

ANNUAL FEE, £33 10s. NO EXTRAS.

For Particulars, apply to the Secretary, Mr. T. W. TURNLEY Bedford.

CAMBRIDGE HOUSE SCHOOL, 120, HAGLEY-ROAD, EDGBASTON, near BIRMINGHAM, conducted by Mr. FREDERIC EWEN with the aid of competent Masters, will reopen on TUESDAY, July 30th.

HEATHFIELD, STONYGATE, LEICESTER.
EDUCATION for YOUNG LADIES, Conducted by the Misses MIALL.
French, Italian, Latin, and German, Music, Singing, and Drawing, Dancing and Calisthenics, taught exclusively by the Masters assigned to them.
The English studies are under the immediate direction of the Misses Miall and competent Governesses.
The house is large and airy, situated in a high and healthy ocality, surrounded by a good garden.
Terms, with references, forwarded on application.

THE CASTLE HALL SCHOOL, NORTHAMPTON.
Conducted by Mrs. THORPE (Widow of the late Rev. T. M. Thorpe), with the assistance of Masters, and Foreign and English Resident Governesses. The School will RE-OPEN JULY 31st.

ESTABLISHMENT for YOUNG GENTLEMEN, HEATHFIELD HOUSE, PARKSTONE—between Poole and Bournemouth.
This Establishment, conducted by Rev. WALTER GILL, aided by competent Masters, will re-open (D.V.), on THURSDAY, August 1st.
Terms moderate. Educational training thorough and comprehensive. Reference to parents of pupils.

WHITE HOUSE, BIRCHINGTON, MARGATE.
Preparatory Education for Boys, conducted by Mr. and Mrs. T. DRAYTON. Terms, 26 Guineas. Home Comforts and Sea Bathing. The course of instruction includes those subjects in an elementary form which are requisite to prepare Pupils for Public Schools. References permitted to Rev. Dr. Raleigh, Highbury New Park, London, and to T. Hunt, Esq., F.R.C.S., 23, Dorset-square, London, N.W.

36, HILLDROP-ROAD, LONDON, N.
LADIES' SCHOOL, conducted by the Misses HEWITT, assisted by superior English and Foreign Masters.
The Year is divided into Three Terms.

STROUD LADIES' COLLEGE, BEECHES' GREEN, STROUD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.
Principals—The Misses HOWARD.
HALF-TERM will BEGIN THURSDAY, Sept. 19th.

VICTORIA VILLA, FINCHLEY, N.
ESTABLISHMENT FOR YOUNG LADIES, Conducted Mrs. WASHINGTON WILKS. The course of instruction embraces the usual branches of a thorough English education, with the French and German Languages; also Piano, Singing, and Drawing taught by competent Masters.

EDUCATION.—PELICAN HOUSE, PECKHAM.
Miss DIXIE, who has succeeded her Aunt, Miss Fletcher, in the Establishment which she so long and successfully conducted, will continue to RECEIVE YOUNG LADIES as Resident and Daily Pupils.
Miss Dixie endeavours to combine the advantages of a sound, first-class Education with the comforts of a happy Christian home.
References kindly permitted to—
Charles Reed, Esq., M.P., Earlsmead, Upper Homerton.
Wm. Cooke, Esq., M.D., M.R.C.S., 3, Lee-place, Upper Clapton.
Wm. Edwards, Esq., Fairfield, Denmark-hill.
Rev. John Pillans, 118, Camberwell-grove.

FERN HOUSE, BRENTWOOD, ESSEX.
The Misses MABBS RECEIVE TEN YOUNG LADIES to Board and Educate, endeavouring to combine family training and home comforts with a superior education and the discipline of school.
The year is divided into three terms.

WESTWOOD PARK HOUSE COLLEGE for YOUNG GENTLEMEN, FOREST-HILL, SYDENHAM.
PRINCIPAL—
The Rev. H. J. CHANCELLOR.
The Course of Instruction includes, besides the usual English Studies, Algebra and Geometry; Book-keeping; Natural Science; Elocution, English Composition and Literature; the Latin, Greek, and French and German Languages.
Pupils are prepared for the Oxford or Cambridge Local Examinations.
The Year is divided into three Sessions.
MASTERS.
Music, Instrumental, and Vocal—JOHN BLOCKLEY, Esq., jun.
Drawing, Modelling, and Perspective—R. W. BUSS, Esq.
French and Mathematics—M. MANDROU, Esq., M.A., Pari Academy.
German—HERR OTTO GERNER.
Natural Science—THOS. JONES, Esq., F.G.S., F.R.A.S.

HIGHBURY HOUSE SCHOOL ST. LEONARD'S-ON-SEA.
Upper, Middle, and Preparatory Departments
Classics, Mathematics, Modern Languages, and thorough English.
Kinder-Garten and Pestalozzian Classes for Little Boys.
The comfort and health of delicate boys especially studied.
A liberal table and watchful care.
Head Master—Rev. W. WOODING, B.A.
For Prospectus apply to Mrs. Duff, Highbury House, St. Leonard's.

EDUCATION—WEST HOUSE, THE WOODLANDS, REDHILL, about half an hour's ride from London, oither by the London and Brighton or the South-Eastern Railway. Situation high and very healthy. An extensive common in the immediate vicinity. Comfortable home; sound and comprehensive Education.—Prospectuses forwarded on application to the Principal, JOHN HILL, M.A.

EVANGELISATION SOCIETY, 18, BUCKINGHAM-STREET, STRAND, W.C.
This Society has been established for several years for the purpose of co-operating with ministers and others in promoting Evangelistic work throughout the country. All expenses are paid when necessary. The meetings to be held on neutral ground when possible. Evangelists of all ranks in life go out for this Society. As long a notice as possible is requested. Apply to the Honorary Secretary, 18, Buckingham-street, Strand, W.C.

THE FREE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—The Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in relation to Ritualism.
Mr. BENNETT has retracted nothing, and yet, after a protracted trial, is not condemned. The Judgment of the Privy Council, in his case, is a tortuous defence of Ritualism.
The *Times* has fairly stated the facts in the following words:—
"The cardinal doctrine of his school is well known as that of the Real Presence in the Elements in the Holy Communion. As corollaries from this doctrine, he taught the duty of paying adoration to such a presence, and alleged that the Priest, in the celebration of the rite, offers a real sacrifice, and exercises true sacerdotal functions. The formal question to be decided was whether Mr. Bennett's statements on these points were so repugnant to the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England as to render him liable to penalty for publishing them. This issue the Judicial Committee have decided on all points in Mr. Bennett's favour."
"When it is laid down, therefore, that Mr. Bennett may say what he has said without violating the law, it must needs be concluded that no legal power exists which can restrain those extreme doctrines on the subject of the Holy Communion, which have of late years startled and most justly offended the vast majority of English Churchmen."
Those extreme doctrines are, according to the avowal of their chief promoters, essentially one with Rome. They say, "We give our people the fact,-the real doctrine of the Mass first, the name will come of itself by-and-by. So with regard to the Cultus of the Virgin, we shall only be able to establish this by slow and cautious steps. We are one with Roman Catholics in faith, and we have a common foe to fight."
The Free Church of England was originated a few years ago, chiefly to oppose Ritualism, and to unite the Laity with the Clergy in the government as well as the work of the Church. If the Laity had been admitted to share in the power which the Clergy alone now wield, they would have made short work with Ritualism long ago.
The Evangelical clergy cannot go into those parishes where Ritualism prevails, but the Free Church of England can. It can go with a revised Prayer Book, from which the priestly element, with its deadly heresies, is cast out; conduct sound Protestant services; and preach the glorious Gospel of the grace of God.
The Free Church of England has already expended over £15,000 in establishing these services, and urgently appeals for donations and subscriptions to extend the movement as iar as may be necessary.
The Council of the Free Church of England invite communications from Protestant Churchmen beset by Ritualism.
Donations and subscriptions may be sent to—
T. LUXMORE WILSON, Esq., Treasurer, 3, Westminster Chambers, Victoria-street, London, W.
Letters may be sent to—
The Rev. S. J. C. DICKSEE, New Maldon, Surrey, S.W., Secretary of the London District.
The Rev. T. DODD, Worcester, Secretary of the Midland District.
The Rev. J. BRUNSKILL, Tottington, near Bury, Lancashire, Secretary of the Northern District.
The Rev. F. NEWMAN, Lynmouth, Devon, Secretary of the Western District.
The Rev. J. SUGDEN, B.A., Teddington, London, S.W., or to
The Rev. T. E. THORESBY, the Parsonage, Spa Fields, London, W.C.
} General Secretaries.
By order of the Council,
Spa Fields Committee Rooms, London, W.C.

BRITISH EMPIRE MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY,
32, NEW BRIDGE STREET, London, E.C.
Established 1847.
(Empowered by Special Act of Parliament.)
DIRECTORS.
DANIEL PRATT, Esq., Chairman.
JOHN RUNTZ, Esq., Vice-Chairman.
Benham, Augustus, Esq.
Bunnell, Peter, Esq.
Burton, John R., Esq.
Groser, William, Esq.
Howat, John B., Esq.
Phillips, George, Esq.
Rooke, George, Esq.
Starling, Robert B., Esq.
Trouncer, John Henry, Esq., M.D., Lond.
Wills, Fredk., jun., Esq.
SOLICITORS—Messrs. Watson and Sons.
PHYSICIAN—E. Headlam Greenhow, M.D., F.R.S.
SURGEON—John Manu, Esq.
ACTUARY AND ACCOUNTANT—Josiah Martin, Esq., F.I.A.
ANNUAL INCOME, £103,792.
ACCUMULATED PREMIUM FUND, £488,310.
Persons assuring this year will share in the next Triennial Bonus to be declared in 1873.
ALFRED LENCH SAUL, Secretary.

THE LONDON AND GENERAL PERMANENT
LAND, BUILDING, AND INVESTMENT SOCIETY.
Shares, £40. Monthly Subscription, 5s. Entrance Fee, 1s. per Share.
337, STRAND, W.C.
TRUSTEES.
The Right Hon. the Earl of Lichfield.
Thomas Hughes, Esq., Q.C., M.P.
The Hon. H. F. Cowper, M.P.
CHAIRMAN OF DIRECTORS.
Thomas Hughes, Esq., Q.C., M.P.
Large or small sums received on deposit, repayable at short notice. Shares may be taken at any time—no back payments.
Money ready to be advanced on Freehold or Leasehold Security.
W. R SELWAY, Managing Director.

SLAVERY and the SLAVE TRADE in EAST AFRICA and ELSEWHERE.
The "ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER" for July, 1872, contains Articles on Slavery in Cuba, The Address of the Yearly Meetings of Friends in America to the King and Cortes of Spain, Skull Hunting and Kidnapping, the Convention between Holland and England to authorise Holland to recruit Labourers in India for Surinam, Fijian Slavery, The Indians in Mauritius and their Grievances, &c., &c.
Also, the Abstract of Proceedings of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to December 31, 1871, and Report of Public Meeting at the Friends' Meeting House, Bishopsgate-street, pp. 38, price Threepence, or by post Threepence Halfpenny, remitted in stamps.—Published at THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 27, New Broad-street, London, E.C., and may be had, by order, of all booksellers.

LONDON.—SHIRLEY'S TEMPERANCE HOTEL, 37, Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, W.C. Beds, from 1s. 6d. Plain Breakfast or Tea, 1s. 3d.
See Testimonials, of which there are a thousand in the Visitors' Book.
"We are more than satisfied; we are truly delighted to find in London so quiet and comfortable a domicile. We shall certainly highly recommend Shirley's to all our friends."—J. ROBERTS, Bourne.
"As on all previous visits, I can testify that this is the most comfortable home I find when away from home."—W. B. HARVEY, Frome.
"After visiting various places in England, I have come to consider Shirley's (in view of its combining the greatest comfort and respectability, with the most moderate charges) as the Temperance Hotel *par excellence*."—J. K. KARCHER, Toronto, C.W.

G. SULLY'S PRIVATE AND COMMERCIAL BOARDING HOUSE and FAMILY HOTEL, 23, EUSTON-road, KING'S CROSS (Corner of Belgrave-street), LONDON. Opposite the Midland and Great Northern, and close to the London and North-Western Termini; also the King's Cross Station of the Metropolitan Railway. Beds from 1s. 6d. Breakfast or Tea 1s. 3d. Attendance 9d. Trains and omnibuses to all parts of the City continually.
EXTRACT FROM VISITORS' BOOK.
"Every attention and very comfortable."
"The House comfortable and all things done well."
"Everything very satisfactory and charges moderate."
"Every comfort and attention; very homely."
"A first-class home at cheap rates."

IRON CHURCHES, IRON BUILDINGS, AND GALVANISED CORRUGATED IRON ROOFING.
Every description of Iron Building, adapted to all climates Improved construction. Thorough ventilation guaranteed Manufactured by
SAMUEL C. HEMMING and CO.
(Established 1851),
25, MOORGATE STREET, CITY.
Numerous testimonials and designs may be seen at the Offices.
Iron Buildings lent on hire, or payment by instalments.

GAZE'S TOURIST TICKETS are the only Tickets issued (by authority) available by the Short Sea Routes *vid* Calais, Boulogne, and Ostend, for Belgium, the Rhine, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, and all parts of the Continent.
TOURIST TICKETS to all Parts of Great Britain.
PERSONALLY CONDUCTED TOURS at frequent intervals to the Rhine, Switzerland, and Italy, &c.
GAZE'S HOTEL COUPONS are the cheapest and best for first-class hotels in all parts of the Continent and the East. See *Tourist Gazette*, 2d.; post free, 3d. Offices: 168, Strand, London.

CUTTINGS of GERANIUMS, &c.—One Hundred Geraniums, in thirty choice varieties, including tricolour, gold, bronze, variegated zonal, nosegay, and ivy leaf, for 10s.; 50, 5s. 6d.; 25, 3s. 24 fancy Pelargoniums, 3s. 6d.; 12, 2s. 24 Chrysanthemums, 2s. 6d.; 12, 1s. 6d. 24 Pompones, 2s. 6d.; 12, 1s. 6d. 24 Fuchsias, 2s. 6d.; 12, 1s. 6d. All post free. Catalogues one stamp.—J. COOMBS, The Ferns, Enfield

HOT WATER APPARATUSES for SCHOOLS, Heating Coils for Halls, Schools, &c., Portable Gas Boilers and Tea Boilers (specially adapted for Tea Meetings, &c.).
G. SHREWSBURY, 59, Old Bailey, and Lower Norwood, S.E.

MR. COOKE BAINES, SURVEYOR and VALUER, PREPARES and NEGOTIATES COMPENSATION CLAIMS for Property Compulsorily taken for Railways and other Improvements, and also Values property for every purpose.—26, Finsbury-place, Moorgate-street, E.C.

NATIONAL INSTITUTION for DISEASES of the SKIN.
Physician—Dr. BARR MEADOWS, 49, Dover-street, W.
Patients attend at 227, Gray's-inn-road, King's-cross, on Mondays and Thursdays, and at 10, Mitre-street, Aldgate, on Wednesdays and Fridays. Mornings at Ten; Evenings, Six till Nine.
Free to the necessitous poor; payment required from other applicants.
THOMAS ROBINSON, Hon. Sec.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—Great Success of UNDINE (written by H. S. Leigh), with splendid optical, spectral, and water effects. Narrated by W. Terrott. Music by Arthur Sullivan and E. Frewin. Scenery by Messrs. Gordon and Harford. Twice daily, at Four and Nine.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC. — Professor GARDNER on ALE, BEER, and GIN, what they are and what they ought to be, with experiments and samples of adulterations. Curiosities of Optical Science, by Mr. King, with new mystical sketch and startling illusions.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC. — MONT CENIS and its TUNNEL, with Vesuvius in Eruption, by Mr. King; Garto, the Demon of Music; and many other amusements. Admission to the whole, 1s.; reserved seats, 2s. 6d., 1s and 6d. Open twice Daily, at Twelve and Seven

"FIELD'S OZOKERIT CANDLES."

PROTECTION FROM FIRE.

BRYANT AND MAY'S
PATENT SAFETY MATCHES
LIGHT ONLY ON THE BOX.

BRYANT AND MAY'S
TRADE MARK—AN ARK.

BRYANT AND MAY'S
PATENT SAFETY MATCHES
ARE NOT POISONOUS.

BRYANT AND MAY'S
PATENT SAFETY MATCHES
WITHOUT PHOSPHORUS.

BRYANT AND MAY'S
PATENT SAFETY MATCHES
LIGHT ONLY ON THE BOX.

BRYANT AND MAY'S
PATENT SAFETY HOLDER
For use wherever a Match is frequently required.

BRYANT AND MAY.

REVOLVING STEEL SAFETY SHUTTERS (self-coiling), fire and thief-proof. Can be adapted to any window or other opening. Prospectuses free.—CLARK and CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone-place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

SAMUEL BROTHERS,
50, *LUDGATE-HILL, LONDON, E.C.*

THE considerable advance in price of Fabrics for the coming season has been anticipated by SAMUEL BROTHERS' extensive ready-money purchases in the great centres of manufacture; hence they have the satisfaction of announcing that there will be NO ADVANCE in the TARIFF which is here submitted to their Patrons.

CLASSIFIED PRICE LIST.

SUMMER SUITS. Business, Morning, and Travelling.	SUMMER SUITS. Visiting, Frock, and Clerical.	SUMMER SUITS. Evening Dress.	CLASS.	SUMMER COATS. Business, Morning, and Travelling.	SUMMER COATS. Visiting, Frock, and Clerical.	SUMMER COATS. Evening Dress.
38s.	43s. 6d.	43s. 6d.	A	17s. 6d.	25s.	—
42s.	49s.	49s.	B	21s.	28s.	28s.
50s.	57s.	57s.	C	26s.	33s.	33s.
59s.	68s.	64s.	D	33s.	42s.	45s.
75s.	83s.	78s.	E	42s.	50s.	50s.
81s.	91s.	86s.	F	45s.	55s.	50s.
94s.	104s.	90s.	G	55s.	65s.	60s.
102s.	112s.	107s.	H	60s.	70s.	65s.
116s.	130s.	121s.	I	70s.	84s.	75s.

All sizes of every class for immediate use, or to measure.	Guide to self-measurement sent free.	Patterns of every class sent free.	All Cloths thoroughly shrunk.	Perfect in style and fit.	Unapproached in style.

SAMUEL BROTHERS, 50, Ludgate-hill.

GENTLEMEN'S and YOUTHS' CLOTHING are illustrated in all the fashionable styles in the BOOK of FASHIONS. Post free for six stamps, deducted from a purchase. Patterns and guide to self-measurement sent free.

CLASSIFIED PRICE LIST.

OVERCOATS. Driving, Walking, and Clerical.	OVERCOATS. Spring and Summer Materials.	OVERCOATS. 'Ulster,' for Travelling.	CLASS.	TROUSERS. Tweeds, Doeskins, and every new Texture.	WAISTCOATS. Thibets, Drills, Tweeds, Silks, and every Novelty.	BOYS' SUITS. 'Zouaves,' 'Beefers,' 'Negligée,' and every Style.
21s.	21s.	30s.	A	12s. 6d.	7s.	16s.
28s.	28s.	42s.	B	14s.	7s.	20s.
33s.	33s.	50s.	C	16s.	8s.	24s.
42s.	42s.	60s.	D	17s. 6d.	8s. 6d.	28s.
50s.	50s.	70s.	E	22s.	11s.	31s.
55s.	55s.	75s.	F	24s.	12s.	34s.
65s.	—	84s.	G	26s.	13s.	38s.
70s.	—	—	H	28s.	14s.	—
84s.	—	—	I	30s.	15s.	—

Illustrated in different styles.	All sizes in stock or to order.	Illustrated in the Book of Fashions.		Unapproach'd in fit and quality.	Fashionable and Novel Fabrics.	Price is regulated according to height.

GENTLEMEN'S and BOYS' CLOTHING can be either purchased ready made or made to measure.

SAMUEL BROTHERS, 50, LUDGATE-Hill, London.

JOHN BENNETT'S WATCHES,
65 & 64, Cheapside.

John Bennett's Gold Presentation Watches, 20, 30, 40 gs.
John Bennett's Ladies' Gold Keyless Watches, from 10 gs.
John Bennett's Silver Watches, with Keyless action, from 6 gs.
John Bennett's Gold Keyless Half-Chronometers, from 30 to 40 gs.
John Bennett's Silver Half-Chronometers, from 16 to 25 gs.
John Bennett's Half-Chronometers are compensated for variations of temperature, adjusted in positions, and need no key.
John Bennett's English Hall Clocks, chiming the quarters, from 30 gs.
John Bennett's richly-gilt Drawing-room Clocks, classic designs.
John Bennett's Marble Dining-room Clocks, with antique bronzes.
John Bennett's 18-carat Hall-marked Chains and choice Jewellery.
John Bennett's Clock and Watch Manufactory, 65 & 64, Cheapside.

TO CAPITALISTS.

Dividends 10 to 20 per Cent. on Outlay.

SHARP'S INVESTMENT CIRCULAR.

The July Number ready—12 pages, post free.
Contains Safe Investments in English and Foreign Railways Debentures, Insurance, Gas, Telegraphs, Banks, Mines Foreign Bonds, American and Colonial Stocks, &c.

CAPITALISTS, SHAREHOLDERS, TRUSTEES
Will find the above Circular a safe, valuable, reliable Guide.
Messrs. SHARP and Co., Stock and Share Brokers,
33, Poultry, London (Established 1832).
Bankers: London and Westminster. Lothbury, E.C.

STATIONERY, PRINTING, ACCOUNT BOOKS, and every requisite for the Counting-house. Qualities and prices will compare advantageously with any house in the trade. The Forms and Account Books required under "The Companies' Acts, 1862 and 1867," kept in stock. Share Certificates Engraved and Printed. Official Seals Designed and Executed.—ASH and FLINT, 49, Fleet-street, City, E.C., and opposite the Railway Stations, London-bridge, S.E.

HARMONIUMS, by GILBERT L. BAUER
Improved ENGLISH MANUFACTURE, suitable for
CHURCH AND CHAPEL SERVICES,
Concert Rooms, Private Families, &c., &c. Price Lists on application, at the Cumberland Works, 49, Tottenham-street, London, W.

FINE FLAVOURED STRONG BEEF TEA at about 2½d. a pint.
ASK FOR LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT of MEAT, requiring Baron Liebig, the Inventor's Signature, on every jar, being the only guarantee of genuineness.
Excellent economical stock for soups, sauces, &c.

A REAL SEA BATH in your own room, by dissolving TIDMAN'S SEA SALT in ordinary water. Five ounces should be used to each gallon. By taking a daily bath prepared with this Salt you enjoy the luxury and the benefits of a course of sea bathing, minus the inconvenience of absence from home, and are adopting the surest means of giving tone to your constitution. Sold in Bags and Boxes by all Chemists and Druggists. Beware of imitations.

TIDMAN'S SEA SALT invigorates the system, fortifies the constitution, braces the nerves, and prevents cold. A daily bath prepared with this salt is the surest way of eradicating rheumatism, neuralgia, sciatica, lumbago, gout, glandular swellings, weakness of the joints, &c. Sold in Bags and Boxes, by Chemists, Druggists, &c. Beware of imitations.

BOUDAULT'S PEPSINE POWDER,
taken by dyspeptics at each meal (bottles of one ounce).
PRIZE OF THE FRENCH INSTITUTE, 1856.
SOLE MEDAL, PARIS EXHIBITION, 1867.
SILVER MEDAL, 1868.
And supplied to the Principal Hospitals of Paris since 1854

BOUDAULT'S PEPSINE WINE
(SHERRY), 4s. & 8s.
Delicious and agreeable to take, and superior to all others.

BOUDAULT'S PEPSINE Lozenges, 4s. Pills, 4s.
A very convenient form for persons travelling.

HOTTOT-BOUDAULT, 7, Avenue Victoria, Paris.
A. & M. ZIMMERMAN, 7, Fen Court, London, E.C.
May be obtained through all Chemists.

LEA AND PERRINS' SAUCE.
THE "WORCESTERSHIRE,"
Pronounced by Connoisseurs, "The only Good Sauce,"
Improves the appetite, and aids digestion.
Unrivalled for piquancy and flavour.

ASK FOR LEA AND PERRINS' SAUCE

BEWARE OF IMITATIONS,
and see the Names of LEA & PERRINS on all bottles and labels.

Agents—CROSSE and BLACKWELL, London, and sold by all Dealers in Sauces throughout the World.

SPECIALITIES IN GLOVES.

BRUSSELS KID (first choice only), one button, 2s. 6d.
Ditto ditto two buttons, 2s. 11d.
Paris Kid, best quality, one button, 3s. 9d.
Ditto ditto two buttons, 4s. 3d.
Kid Gloves, with 3 to 6 buttons, from 2s. 9d. per pair
Gants de Suéde (Swedish Gloves) two buttons only, 1 per pair.
Extra long ditto, without buttons, 2s. 6d. per pair.
Russian Calf (double sewn), 2s. 11d. per pair.
Saxony Gauntlet Gloves, without buttons, 1s. 11d. per pair.
GENTLEMEN'S GLOVES—Brussels Kid, 3s. 6d.
Paris Kid, 4s. 6d.
Russian Calf, 2s. 9d.
The new Cape Driving Glove, 2s. 6d. per pair.
Sample pair of any description post free on receipt of stamps.

DEBENHAM AND FREEBODY,
WIGMORE STREET AND WELBECK STREET,
LONDON, W.

LADIES' FASHIONABLE WALKING SHOES, 18s. 6d.; Boots for Croquet, 21s. Illustrated Catalogues post free.—THOMAS D. MARSHALL, 192, Oxford-street, W.

FRY'S CARACAS COCOA.
"A most delicious and valuable article."—Standard.
Nothing can be found at all equal to it."—Court Circular.

FRY'S CARACAS COCOA.
"A packet can be easily obtained, and its delicate flavour and fine aroma secure its adoption as a beverage for breakfast or supper."—Standard.

FRY'S EXTRACT OF COCOA.
The pure Cocoa Nib deprived of its superfluous oil.
N.B.—A sample, post free, on application.
J. S. FRY and SONS, Bristol and London.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.

This celebrated and most delicious old mellow spirit is the very CREAM of IRISH WHISKIES, in quality unrivalled, perfectly pure, and more wholesome than the finest Cognac Brandy. Note the words—

"KINAHAN'S LL"

on Seal, Label, and Cork.

Wholesale Depôt, 20, Great Titchfield-street, Oxford-street, W.

COALS.—LEA and CO.'S PRICES.—Hetton or Lambton, 31s.; Hartlepool, 30s. best Wigan, 29s.; best Silkstone, 29s.; new Silkstone, 28s.; Primrose, 27s.; Derby Bright, 26s.; Barnsley, 26s.; Kitchen, 25s; Hartley, 24s.; Hard Steam, 24s.; Nuts, 23s. Net cash. Delivered thoroughly screened. Depôts, Highbury and Highgate, N.; Kingsland, E.; Beauvoir Wharf, Kingsland-road; Great Northern Railway Stations, King's-cross and Holloway; and 4 and 5 Wharves, Regent's-park-basin. No Agents.

COALS.—GEORGE J. COCKERELL and COMPANY, Coal Merchants to the Queen and to the Royal Family. Sell only the best Wallsend, and the best inland. For prices see daily papers.—Central Office, 13, Cornhill; West End Office, next Grosvenor Hotel, Pimlico. G. J. C. and Co. recommend purchases.

COALS.—The East Hettons (no better burning Coal in the world, and giving the greatest satisfaction), 32s.; Durham Wallsend, 32s.; second, ditto, 31s.; best Silkstones, 29s.; second, ditto, 28s.; Brights, best, 26s.; seconds, ditto, 25s.; Hartley, 25s.; coke, 20s.
Orders by post will have immediate attention.
James Dawbarn and Co., 50, Coal Department, King's cross, N.W.

PURE AERATED WATERS.
ELLIS'S RUTHIN WATERS,
Soda, Potass, Seltzer, Lemonade,
Lithia, and for GOUT, Lithia & Potass.
CORKS BRANDED "R. ELLIS & SON, RUTHIN," and every label bears their trade mark. Sold everywhere, and Wholesale of R. Ellis & Son, Ruthin, North Wales. London Agents:—W. Best & Son, Henrietta-street, Cavendish-uare.

The Ladies are respectfully solicited to make a trial of the

GLENFIELD STARCH,

which they will find to be far superior to any other Starch for dressing Laces, Linens, &c.

It is now used in all Laundries, from the cottage to the palace, and when once tried is found to be indispensable

When you ask for Glenfield Starch, see that you get it,

as inferior kinds are often substituted for the sake extra profits.

W. G. NIXEY'S Refined BLACK LEAD.
"CLEANLINESS."
The Proprietor begs to CAUTION the Public against being imposed upon by unprincipled tradesmen, who, with a view of deriving greater profit, are manufacturing and vending SPURIOUS IMITATIONS of the above article.
Ask for
W. G. NIXEY'S BLACK LEAD.
And see that you have it.—12, Soho-square, London, W.

KAYE'S WORSDELL'S PILLS.—Indulgence of the appetite is often followed with dyspepsia, indigestion, headache, and other stomach complaints. The prompt use of KAYE'S WORSDELL'S PILLS will give immediate relief, and prove a most efficacious restorative. Sold by all Chemists and other Dealers in Patent Medicine, at 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., and 4s. 6d. per box.

FRAGRANT SOAP.

The celebrated "UNITED SERVICE" TABLET is famed for its delightful fragrance and beneficial effect on the skin.

Manufactured by
J. C. & J. FIELD, Patentees of the Self-fitting Candles.

Sold by Chemists, Oil and Italian Warehousemen, and others.

*** Use no other. See name on each tablet.

"REMARKABLE, very remarkable, indeed," are the effects of Lamplough's Pyretic Saline in preventing and curing Small-pox, Fevers, and Skin Diseases. Specially refreshing and invigorating during hot weather. Sold by all Chemists, and the Maker,

113, Holborn-hill, London.

ASTHMA AND BRONCHITIS

Effectually relieved by the use of "DATURA TATULA," for "in a most fearful attack of asthma, Lord Dunsany had scarcely smoked the DATURA TATULA for more than a minute or so when the symptoms abated, and in ten minutes more he was relieved wonderfully. He told me he had used it for years with the most perfect success. Certainly the inhalation had the most magical effect I ever witnessed."—Dr J. McVeagh. "I have never known an instance in which relief was not obtained."—Gen. Alexander. Sold as tobacco, in tins, 2s. 6d., 5s., 10s., and 18s. Cigars and Cigarettes, in boxes, 3s., 6s. 8s., and 15s. Pastilles for inhalation, boxes, 2s. 6d., 5s., and 10s.

SAVORY & MOORE, 143, New Bond-street, London.

IMPERFECT DIGESTION AND ASSIMILATION.

SAVORY & MOORE'S PANCREATIC EMULSION and PANCREATINE are the most potent remedial agents. They are the only remedies yet known for effecting the digestion of Cod Liver Oil and preventing nausea, while they also efficiently supply the place of the oil when rejected by the stomach. These facts are now attested by the published records of numerous medical men, extracts from which accompany each bottle. Price from 2s. to 21s.

SAVORY & MOORE, 143, New Bond-street, London, and all Chemists.

NOTE.—Name and trade mark on each bottle.

BEST FOOD FOR INFANTS.

"Resembling Mother's Milk as closely as possible."—Dr. H. Barker on Right Foods.

"The Infant Prince thrives upon it as a Prince should."—Social Science Review.

"Highly nourishing and easily digested."—Dr. Hassall.

No Boiling or Straining required. Tins, 1s., 2s., 5s., and 10s

Prepared by
SAVORY and MOORE, 143, New Bond-street, London.
Procurable of all Chemists and Italian Warehousemen.

THE BLOOD PURIFIER.

NO ONE SHOULD BE WITHOUT THE BLOOD PURIFIER.—Old Dr. Jacob Townsend's Sarsaparilla is the great purifier of the blood, it effects the most salutary changes in disease; cures scrofula, scorbutic disorders, chronic sore eyes, rheumatism, piles, liver complaints, erysipelas, all blotches and eruptions of the skin, it removes every impurity of the blood, and all humours and morbid collections of the body, in short, it acts like a charm. In bottles, 2s. 6d., 4s. 0d., 4s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 11s. 0d. Pills and Ointment, each in boxes, 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., by post for 15, 36, and 60 stamps. Sold by all Druggists. Chief Depôt, 131, Fleet-street, London. Get the red and blue wrapper with the old Dr.'s head in the centre.

RUPTURES.

BY HER MAJESTY'S ROYAL LETTERS PATENT.

WHITE'S MOC-MAIN PATENT LEVER TRUSS, requiring no steel spring round the body, is recommended for the following peculiarities and advantages:—1st. Facility of application; 2nd. Perfect freedom from liability to chafe or excoriate; 3rd. It may be worn with equal comfort in any position of the body, by night or day; 4th. It admits of every kind of exercise without the slightest inconvenience to the wearer, and is perfectly concealed from observation.

"We do not hesitate to give to this invention our unqualified approbation; and we strenuously advise the use of it to all those who stand in need of that protection, which they cannot so fully, nor with the same comfort, obtain from any other apparatus or truss as from that which we have the highest satisfaction in thus recommending."—*Church and State Gazette.*

Recommended by the following eminent Surgeons:—Sir William Fergusson, Bart., F.R.S., Professor of Surgery in King's College, Surgeon to King's College Hospital, &c.; C.G. Guthrie, Esq., Surgeon to the Royal Westminster Ophthalmic Hospital; W. Bowman, Esq., F.R.S., Assistant-Surgeon to King's College Hospital; T. Callaway, Esq., Senior Assistant-Surgeon to Guy's Hospital; W. Coulson, Esq., F.R.S., Surgeon to the Magdalen Hospital; T. Blizard Curling, Esq., F.R.C.S., Surgeon to the London Hospital; W. J. Fisher, Esq., Surgeon-in-Chief to the Metropolitan Police Force; Aston Key, Esq., Surgeon to Prince Albert; Robert Liston, Esq., F.R.S.; James Luke, Esq., Surgeon to the London Truss Society; Erasmus Wilson, Esq., F.R.S.; and many others.

A Descriptive Circular may be had by post, and the Truss (which cannot fail to fit) can be forwarded by post, on sending the circumference of the body, two inches below the hips, to the Manufacturer.

Mr. WHITE, 228, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

Price of a Single Truss, 16s., 21s., 26s. 6d., and 31s. 6d. Postage, free.

Price of a Double Truss, 31s. 6d., 42s., and 52s. 6d. Postage, free.

Price of an Umbilical Truss, 42s. and 52s. Postage, free.

Post Office Orders to be made payable to John White, Post Office, Piccadilly.

NEW PATENT

ELASTIC STOCKINGS, KNEE-CAPS, &c.—The material of which these are made is recommended by the Faculty as being peculiarly elastic and compressible, and the best invention for giving efficient and permanent support in all cases of WEAKNESS and swelling of the LEGS, VARICOSE VEINS, SPRAINS, &c. It is porous, light in texture, and inexpensive, and is drawn on like an ordinary stocking. Price 4s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 10s., and 16s. each. Postage, free.

John White, Manufacturer, 228, Piccadilly, London.

THE LITERARY MACHINE (Patented), for holding a book, writing-desk, lamp, meals, umbrella, &c., in any position over a bed, sofa, easy chair, carriage, garden seat, or yacht. As used by Princess Louise. Invaluable to invalids and students. Admirably adapted for India. A most useful and elegant wedding or birthday gift. Prices from 20s. and 50s. Drawings free.—J. Carter, 55, Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square, London, W.

TO BOOKBUYERS.—GRAVE-MOUNDS and THEIR CONTENTS: A Manual of Archæology, as exemplified in the Burials of the Celtic, the Romano British, and the Anglo Saxon Periods. By L. JEWITT F.S.A. Nearly 500 engravings. Thick crown 8vo, cloth, gilt edges, published at 10s. 6d., only 4s. 6d.; postage 6d. W. Glaisher, Bookseller, 265, High Holborn, London, having just purchased the entire remainder of the above book, offers it at the above low price. A catalogue of a very large collection of modern books, all quite new, in cloth, &c., at very low prices, sent on receipt of a penny stamp.

CHARTA PERFECTA.—This new and beautiful note-paper is the most perfect ever made.

"Is pleasant to the eye; delightful to write upon."—Observer.

"Never varies, is free from all impediments to rapid writing."—Daily News.

Specimen packets, containing six varieties, post free One Shilling.

JENNER and KNEWSTUB, to the Queen and Prince of Wales, Dressing-case Makers, Die Sinkers, Stationers, and Heraldic Engravers, 33, St. James's-street, and 66, Jermyn-street.

OXYGENATED WATER FOR
PUBLIC SPEAKERS,
PUBLIC PREACHERS,
PUBLIC SINGERS, and
CROWDED HEARERS.

Those in delicate health, and restless sleepers, are strengthened and soothed by drinking the above.

Sold at the Laboratory, 36, Long Acre, W.C.

A FACT.—ALEX. ROSS'S HAIR-COLOUR WASH will in two days cause grey hair or whiskers to become their original colour. This is guaranteed by Alex. Ross. It is merely necessary to damp the hair with it. Price 10s. 6d.; sent for stamps.—248, High Holborn, London.

SPANISH FLY is the acting ingredient in Alex. Ross's CANTHARIDES OIL. It is a sure restorer of Hair and a producer of Whiskers. The effect is speedy. It is patronised b Royalty. The price is 3s. 6d.; sent for stamps.

ALEX. ROSS'S HAIR CURLING FLUID—It curls immediately straight and ungovernable Hair. It is of no consequence how straight or ungovernable the hair is when it is used. Sold at 3s. 6d.; sent for 54 stamps.

CORNS and BUNIONS.—A gentleman, many years tormented with Corns, will be happy to afford others the information by which he obtained their complete removal in a short period, without pain or any inconvenience.—Forward address, on a stamped envelope, to F. Kingston, Esq., Church-street, Ware, Herts.

JOHN GOSNELL and CO.'s
"CHERRY TOOTH PASTE" greatly excels all other preparations for the Teeth.
"AGUA AMARELLA" restores the Human Hair to its pristine hue, no matter at what age.
"TOILET and NURSERY POWDER" beautifully perfumed and guaranteed pure.

ASK for JOHN GOSNELL and CO.'s, and see that you have none other than their *genuine* Articles.

Sold by all respectable
CHEMISTS and PERFUMERS.
Wholesale, Angel-passage, 93, Upper Thames-street, London

CROSBY'S
BALSAMIC COUGH ELIXIR.

Opiates, Narcotics, and Squills are too often invoked to give relief in Coughs, Colds, and all Pulmonary Diseases. Instead of such fallacious remedies, which yield momentary relief at the expense of enfeebling the digestive organs, and thus increasing that debility which lies at the root of the malady, modern science points to CROSBY'S BALSAMIC COUGH ELIXIR as the true remedy.

SELECT TESTIMONIAL.

Dr. Rooke, Scarborough, author of the "Anti-Lancet," says:—"I have repeatedly observed how very rapidly and invariably it subdued Cough, Pain, and Irritation of the Chest in cases of Pulmonary Consumption, and I can, with the greatest confidence, recommend it as a most valuable adjunct to an otherwise strengthening treatment for this disease."

This medicine, which is free from opium and squills, not only allays the local irritation, but improves digestion and strengthens the constitution. Hence it is used with the most signal success in Asthma, Bronchitis, Consumption Coughs, Influenza, Night Sweats of Consumption, Quinsy, and all affections of the throat and chest. Sold by all respectable Chemists and Patent Medicine Dealers, in bottles, at 1s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. each; and also by James M. Crosby Chemist, Scarborough.

*** Invalids should read Crosby's Prize Treatise on "Diseases of the Lungs and Air Vessels," a copy of which can be had gratis of all Chemists.

HOOPING COUGH.—ROCHE'S HERBAL EMBROCATION is recommended by many of the most eminent of the Faculty as the only known safe and perfect cure, without restriction of diet or use of medicine. Sold by most Chemists in bottles, at 4s. each. Wholesale Agent, Edwards, 38, Old Change, London.

KAINS'S CHLOROFORMED LAUGHING GAS EYE SNUFF cures deafness, noise in the head, stammering, fits, neuralgia, dimness of sight, tic-douloreux, headache, faceache, and toothache. A pleasant, agreeable, and pleasing sensation; it makes the afflicted laugh who never laughed before; and those who used to laugh still laugh the more. In boxes, post free, 15 stamps. Address, Kains's Patent Medical Snuff Mills, Smithfield Market, Birmingham.

HODDER & STOUGHTON'S LIST.

THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW,

No. CXI., for JULY, now ready, price 6s.

CONTENTS.

1. WILLIAM OF OCCAM.
2. WIT AND HUMOUR.
3. OUR COAL SUPPLY.
4. MARCO POLO.
5. AN ECCLESIASTICAL TOURNAMENT IN EDINBURGH.
6. THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' STRIKE.
7. PRUSSIAN INFLUENCE ON GERMAN LITERATURE.
8. RESULTS OF DISESTABLISHMENT IN IRELAND.
9. CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

Now ready, price 6d.

THE CONGREGATIONALIST for JULY.

Edited by R. W. DALE, M.A.

CONTENTS.

Mr. Eustace Conder on Religious Education by the State.
The Bennett Judgment.
Three Monastic Graces—II. The Grace of Simplicity. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A.
The Baptismal Office of the Anglican Church.
Aspects of Modern Preaching—III., Its Want of Urgency.
The Physiognomy of Scripture Portraits—Simon and Judas.
Righteousness and Great Mountains. By Enoch Mellor, D.D.
"Measure for Measure."
Labourers in Council.
Notices of New Books. Congregational Register.

THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LECTURES,

1872. The following are now ready, price 6d each:—

I.

MAN: a WITNESS for CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. JOSEPH ANGUS, M.A., D.D., President of Regent's Park College.

II.

THE EVIDENCE AFFORDED by the ORDER and ADAPTATIONS in NATURE to the EXISTENCE of a GOD. By CHARLES BROOKE, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., Consulting Surgeon of the Westminster Hospital.

III.

THE PHILOSOPHY of HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY. By the Rev. Canon BIRKS, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge.

The other Lectures will be published as delivered.

THE DOCTRINE of the REAL PRESENCE

and of the LORD'S SUPPER By R. W. DALE, M.A. See "Ecclesia: Church Problems Considered." A Series of Essays edited by H R. Reynolds, D.D., President of Cheshunt College. In 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

"The Essays are all temperate and able; worthy to be widely read and pondered by Churchmen."—Edinburgh Review.

DR. UEBERWEG'S PHILOSOPHY.

Now ready, in royal 8vo, price 18s., handsomely bound,

A HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY, from Thales

to the present time. By Dr. FRIEDRICH UEBERWEG, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Königsberg. With additions by NOAH PORTER, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College. Vol. I. History of the Ancient and Mediæval Philosophy.

Subscribers who will send their names to the Publishers direct, or through their own booksellers, accompanied by a remittance, will be charged £1 5s. for the two volumes. The Publishers of this work have most judiciously sent it forth as the preliminary volume of their projected "Theological and Philosophical Library." No work could have been selected more appropriate to lead off in such a series than the great work of Dr. Ueberweg before us, which has deservedly become the most popular, the most authoritative work on the subject, in a country rich beyond all others in excellent works of a similar character, though inferior to it in fulness of information, accuracy of detail, and comprehensiveness of plan. In no language does a work exist which so completely supplies the want we have already indicated of a combined and comprehensive history of philosophical and religious thought, from the earliest times, as does Dr. Ueberweg's standard work. The late Dean Mansel, whose authority to speak on such a matter was that of a master mind, we know placed the very highest value on this work, as the most perfect and impartial of its kind, which he regretted was not translated into English for the benefit of English readers. It is clear and concise in its statements, systematic in its arrangement, accurate in detail, impartial in tone, never dull, and never tedious.

THE MORE EXCELLENT WAY: Sermons

intended to help those who desire to lead a better life. By ROBERT TUCK, B.A. This Day, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

HEART LIFE. By Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D.,

of Brooklyn. Price 1s. 6d., neat cloth.

THE NEW TESTAMENT VIEW of the OLD.

A contribution to Biblical Introduction and Exegesis. By DAVID M'C. TURPIE, M.A., Author of "The Old Testament in the New." Now ready, in 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

Now ready, a Third Edition of

THE LIFE of THOMAS COOPER. Written

by Himself. With a portrait, 7s. 6d.

"The old man 'fights his battles o'er again' with a vigour and enjoyment that can hardly fail to amuse and interest the readers of his stirring narrative."—Spectator.

New and cheaper Edition, in one volume,

FIJI and the FIJIANS. By Thomas

WILLIAMS. Together with the Mission History, by JAMES CALVERT. In one volume, with numerous Illustrations. Price 6s. cloth.

"Replete with valuable information, some of it of a startling kind."—Quarterly Review.

MRS. ELLIS'S LAST WORK.

THE EDUCATION of the HEART: Woman's

best work. Price 8s. 6d.

"A series of pleasantly written essays. The book is well worth reading. . . . It is full of suggestions."—Athenæum.

This Day, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

PASTOR and PEOPLE: a Ministerial Charge

and Directory. By GEORGE MACAULAY, Minister of the Free Church, Old Kilpatrick.

By the same Author,

PURITAN THEOLOGY; or, Law, Grace, and

Truth. Being Discourses Polemical, Practical, and Historical. 2 vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

London: HODDER and STOUGHTON, 27, Paternoster-row.

At all the Libraries, each in 3 Vols.

THE LOST BRIDE. By LADY CHATTERTON.
"This book is pleasant reading."—Examiner.

FIRST in the FIELD. By the Author of "Recommended to Mercy, &c.

LIL. By JEAN MIDDLEMASS.
"The interest never flags."—Court Journal.

A GOLDEN SORROW. By Mrs. CASHEL HOEY.
"A very pleasant, lively novel."—Spectator.

CHEAP EDITION of HANNAH. By the Author of "John Halifax," forming the new volume of "Hurst and Blackett's Standard Library." 5s. bound and illustrated.

Hurst and Blackett, Publishers, 13, Great Marlborough-street.

NEW LIBRARY EDITION, RE-WRITTEN.
Now ready, 1 vol. demy 8vo, with Portrait, 12s.,

HISTORY of WILLIAM PENN, Founder of Pennsylvania. By W. HEPWORTH DIXON.
"In dealing with a mass of new materials, I have been led to write my book afresh. It would be no misuse of words to say that William Penn, Founder of Pennsylvania, is substantially a new book."—Extract from the Preface.

Hurst and Blackett, Publishers, 13, Great Marlborough-street.

This day is published, crown 8vo, price 6s. 6d.,

THE DAYS OF THE SON OF MAN.
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE TIME OF OUR LORD,
By WILLIAM LEE, D.D.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London

This day is published, crown 8vo, price 5s.,

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIANITY;
Or, THE PURPOSE AND POWER OF THE GOSPEL.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London

FOR THE TOURIST SEASON.

SWISS PICTURES, DRAWN with PEN and PENCIL. By the Author of "Spanish Pictures." With numerous Illustrations by E. WHYMPER and others. A third Edition, greatly improved by the addition of many fine Engravings. Imp. 8vo, 8s., handsomely bound.
"Its numerous wood-engravings are all of great excellence; charming as pictures and admirable as examples of art."—Art Journal.
"In this Third Edition there are so many additions and improvements, that this very beautiful volume is still more attractive and beautiful than before."—Standard.

SPANISH PICTURES, DRAWN with PEN and PENCIL.—By the Author of "Swiss Pictures, Drawn with Pen and Pencil." With Illustrations by GUSTAVE DORE and other eminent artists. Imp. 8vo, 8s., handsomely bound.
"The letterpress is pleasant reading, and many of the sketches are of the highest excellence."—Times.
"A volume that does credit to the writer and to the artists employed.'—Pall Mall Gazette.
"A most exquisite book. It abounds with illustrations of the most striking scenes, buildings, and social manners of the Peninsula; and realises in a series of brilliant and attractive pictures the romance, poetry, beauty, and inexpressible charms of the land."—Daily News.

London: Religious Tract Society, 56, Paternoster-row, and 164, Piccadilly; and all Booksellers.

Just published, price 2s. 6d. cloth,

IS WATER BAPTISM an INSTITUTION of CHRIST? By W. BLACKLEY, M.A., late Vicar of Stanton, Salop. "The writer maintains the negative of the question which forms the title of his little *brochure*, and does so with an earnestness and ability which will command respect even from the most vigorous opponents."—The Literary World. "He shows careful and reverent study of Scripture, and his book is well worth perusal were it only for the intense earnestness it displays on behalf of spiritual religion."—Christian Age.

London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster-row.

THE CLASS AND THE DESK:
Bevelled cloth, 3s. each volume, post free,
30,000 VOLUMES SOLD.

This original, unique, and unrivalled work consists of three series:—The OLD TESTAMENT contains 144 Prepared Lessons. The GOSPELS and ACTS contain 120 Prepared Lessons, with 50 Outlines of Sunday-school Addresses. The EPISTLES contain 115 Lessons and 45 Outlines of Sunday-school Addresses. All the Series are equally applicable to the Class in Schools, the Desk in addresses, and the Pulpit in regular discourses. Each Series is accompanied with copious indexes, and contains about 4,000 Scripture refere
Vol. I. The OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. J. COMPER GRAY.
Vol. II. The GOSPELS and ACTS. By the Rev. J. COMPER GRAY.
Vol. III. The EPISTLES. By the Rev. C. STOKES CAREY.
"The whole of the volumes have been prepared with great care, and as a repertoire of biblical knowledge and condensed thought we know of no work equal to them."—*Western Daily Press.*

In Church-style cloth, gilt, red edges; 52 Chapters, 192 pp. 8vo, 200 Woodcuts, 16 full-page tinted Illustrations, price 3s., post free,

SUNDAY HALF-HOURS. (10th thousand).
"We have rarely met with a cheap book which is also so thoroughly good: it is one upon which thought and taste and culture have been bestowed altogether out of proportion to its size and appearance."—*Guardian.*

London: James Sangster and Co., 31, Paternoster-row, E.C.

Now ready, Part 81, price 6d.

THE QUIVER FOR JULY, containing The Dingy House at Kensington.—New Serial Story, by the Author of "About Nelly," &c.—Two Stories in One. By W. W. Gilbert, Author of "Shirley Hall Asylum."—Sigmund of the Cape. Part II. By Hon Augusta Bethell.—Domestic Broils, and How to Mend Them. By the Rev. Dr. Edersheim.—Songs in the Night. By the Rev. Herbert Rowsell, M.A.—Shadows. By the Rev. T. M. Morris.—A Word upon Having it Out. By the Rev. W. M. Statham.—The British and Foreign Bible Society. By the Author of "The Book and its Mission."—Bible Notes, The Quiver Bible Class, Poems, &c., &c.—Frontispiece—"Blind Matthew." Drawn by Robert Barnes. Other Illustrations by J. D. Watson, F. A. Fraser, J. Mc L. Ralston, E. F. Brewtnall, &c., &c.
SPECIAL NOTICE.—In the August Part will be given a Frontispiece, beautifully executed by the Heliotype Process—"Christ Walking on the Sea," from the celebrated Painting by Jalabert.
Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.

Now ready, price 3s.

LITTLE FOLKS, VOL. III., containing nearly 500 PICTURES.
*** Vols. I. and II. of LITTLE FOLKS, containing 1,000 Pictures, have been several times reprinted, and can still be had. Coloured boards, 3s.; cloth gilt, gilt edges, 5s. each.
Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.

NEW HIGH-CLASS BOOK ON ETIQUETTE.
Second Edition, cloth, gilt edges, 2s. 6d.; post free, 2s. 9d.

THE MANNERS of MODERN SOCIETY. A Comprehensive and Practical Work on the Etiquette of the Present Day.
"One of the most sensible and rational books of its kind we have happened to see."—Pall Mall Gazette.
Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.

GOOD WORDS for JULY, Sixpence Monthly, Illustrated, is now ready, and Contains:—
IN MEMORIAM—NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D. By A. P. STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster, and important Contributions by—

Rev. Charles Kingsley.	Rev. Principal Tulloch.
Mrs. Oliphant.	Eliza Meteyard.
Anthony Trollope.	William Gilbert.
Ada Cambridge.	Isabella Fyvie.
George Forbes, F.R.S.E.	Dr. T. Farquhar.
H. A. Page.	F. M. F. Skene.

Dora Greenwell.
Strahan and Co. Ludgate-hill, and all Booksellers.

WORKS BY THE LATE
NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.

Peeps at the Far East. A Familiar Account of a Visit to India. With Illustrations. Small 4to, 21s.
Eastward. Travels in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s.
Character Sketches. With Illustrations. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.
The Starling. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s.
The Old Lieutenant and his Son. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
Reminiscences of a Highland Parish. Crown 8vo, 6s.
The Earnest Student: being Memorials of John Mackintosh. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
The Gold Thread. A Story for the Young. With Illustrations. Square 8vo, 2s. 6d.
Wee Davie. Sewed, 6d.
Parish Papers. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
Simple Truth Spoken to Working People. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.
War and Judgment. A Sermon Preached before the Queen, and Published by Her Majesty's Command. Sewed, 1s.
How can we best relieve our Deserving Poor? Sewed, 6d.
Concluding Address to the Assembly of the Church of Scotland. May, 1869. Sewed, 1s.

STRAHAN and CO., 56, Ludgate-hill, London.

MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE. No. 153.
FOR JULY, Price 1s.
CONTENTS OF THE NUMBER.
1. "The Middle Ages and the Revival of Learning." By W G. Clark. Part 1.
2. "The Strange Adventures of a Phæton." By William Black, Author of "A Daughter of Heth," &c. Chapters XIX.—XXI.
3. "Ta'Abbet Shurran and his Companions." By W. Gifford Palgrave. Concluded.
4. "Thoughts upon Government." Chapter III.
5. "Christina North" Conclusion.
6. "Music in England." By Henry Leslie.
7. "To Genista." By F. N. B.
8. "The Agricultural Labourer." By the Rev. Edward Girdlestone, Canon of Bristol.

Ready next week, in crown 8vo, handsomely bound in cloth, price 2s. 6d., by post 2s. 8d.,

MIDSUMMER MORNING SERMONS to YOUNG MEN and MAIDENS. By the Rev. W. BROCK. The entire series (20) in one volume.
London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster-row, E.C., and all Booksellers.

Now ready, crown 8vo, with Portrait, price 7s. 6d.,

LIFE of the LATE JOHN DUNCAN, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages, New College, Edinburgh. By DAVID BROWN, D.D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen.
Edmonston and Douglas, Edinburgh, and all Booksellers.

LIST OF SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL NEW BOOKS IN CIRCULATION AT
MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.

Fresh Copies of all the Books on this List are added as the demand increases, and an ample supply is provided of all forthcoming works of general interest as they appear.

Historical Essays, by E. A. Freeman; *History of the House of Condé*, by the Duc d'Aumale; Dean Stanley's *History of the Church of Scotland*; Taine's *Notes on England*; *Letters and Journals of the Late Earl of Elgin*; *Life of Sir Henry Lawrence*; *The Higher Ministry of Nature*, by J. R. Leifchild; *A Group of Englishmen*, by Eliza Meteyard; Taine's *History of English Literature*; *Memoir of Robert Chambers*; *Christ in Modern Life*, by Rev. Stopford Brooke; *Yesterdays with Authors*, by James T. Fields; *Paul of Tarsus*, by a Graduate; *The Garden and the City*, by Hugh Macmillan; *Lectures and Essays*, by Mr. and Mrs. Fawcett; *Essays on Cathedrals*, by Various Writers; *Autobiography of Thomas Cooper*; Leoni Levi's *History of British Commerce*; *Life of Margaret of Anjou*, by Mrs. Hookham; Dean Hook's *Life of Archbishop Parker*; *Fly-Leaves*, by C. S. C.; *Stray Leaves*, by C. E. M.; Forster's *Life of Charles Dickens*; *The Switzers*, by W. Hepworth Dixon; *Unexplored Syria*, by Captain Burton; *Visits to High Tartary*, by Robert Shaw; *The Wars of the Huguenots*, by Dr. Hanna; *Olrig Grange*; *Under the Sun*, by G. A. Sala; Longfellow's *Three Books of Song*; Zincke's *Egypt*; a Second Series of *Ecclesia*; *Life in India*, by Edward Braddon; Dixon's *History of William Penn*; *Try Cracow*, by A. H. Hutchinson; *Michael Faraday*, by J. H. Gladstone; *Mendelssohn and Goethe in 1821*; *Early Church History*, by Dr. William Lee; *Prairie Farms and Prairie Folk*, by Parker Gilmore; *A Man's Thoughts*, by J. Hain Friswell; *Sir Henry Holland's Recollections*; *An Australian Parsonage*, by Mrs. Edward Millett; *Lectures on Christian Art*, by the Rev. R. S. Tyrwhitt; *Pictures of Old Rome*, by Mrs. Elliot; *New Homes in Australia*, by G. S. Baden-Powell; *Experiences of a Diplomatist*, by John Ward; *Diaries and Letters of Sir George Jackson*; *Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada*, by Clarence King; *Men of the Second Empire*, by Trois-Etoiles; *Ancient Stone Implements*, by John Evans; *Six Months in California*, by J. G. Player-Frowd; *Elements of Intellectual Science*, by Noah Porter; Hubner's *Life of Pope Sixtus the Fifth*; *Life of Count Beugnot*; *Life of the Rev. A. R. Dallas*; *Works of J. H. Frere*; *Lord Brougham's Autobiography*; *Music and Morals*, by Rev. H. R. Haweis; *Legends of the Old Testament*, by Baring-Gould; *The Fortunate Isles*, by E. Pégot-Ogier; *At Home with the Patagonians*, by Captain Musters; *The Culture of Pleasure*; *Life of St. Chrysostom*, by W. R. W. Stephens; *Twenty-Five Years of My Life*, by A. de Lamartine; De Tocqueville's *Correspondence with N. W. Senior*; Freeman's *Reign of William the Conqueror*; *Flowers and Gardens*, by Watson Forbes; *Bampton Lectures*, 1871, by G. H. Curteis; *The Court of Anna Carafa*, by Mrs. H. R. St. John; *Discussions on Various Subjects*, by Dr. Newman; *Sport at Home and Abroad*, by Lord William Lennox; *In France with the German Army*, by Colonel Corvin; *Eight Months on Duty in Chanzy's Army*; *A Few Days in Belgium*, by Lady Lees.

ALL THE BEST RECENT NOVELS and many other Works of acknowledged merit and general interest.

FIRST-CLASS SUBSCRIPTION, ONE GUINEA PER ANNUM.
BOOK SOCIETIES SUPPLIED ON LIBERAL TERMS.
Prospectuses postage free on application.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY (Limited), NEW OXFORD-STREET.
CITY OFFICE—2, KING-STREET, CHEAPSIDE.

EDMONSTON & DOUGLAS'S
NEW BOOKS.

PROFESSOR RITSCHL.
A CRITICAL HISTORY of the CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE of JUSTIFICATION and RECONCILIATION. By ALBRECHT RITSCHL, Professor Ordinarius of Theology in the University of Gottingen. Translated from the German, with the Author's sanction, by JOHN S. BLACK, M.A. 8vo, price 12s.

DR. STEANE.
THE DOCTRINE of CHRIST DEVELOPED by the APOSTLES: a Treatise on the Offices of the Redeemer and the Doxology of the Redeemed. By Rev. EDWARD STEANE, D.D. 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

PROFESSOR DAVID BROWN.
LIFE of the LATE JOHN DUNCAN, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages, New College, Edinburgh. By DAVID BROWN, D.D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen. Crown 8vo, with Portrait, price 7s. 6d.

MR. KNIGHT.
COLLOQUIA PERIPATETICA. By the late JOHN DUNCAN, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Being Conversations in Philosophy, Theology, and Religion. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM KNIGHT, Dundee. Third Edition. Fscp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

PRINCIPAL SHAIRP.
CULTURE and RELIGION. By J. C. SHAIRP, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard's, St. Andrew's. Fscp. 8vo. Third Edition, price 3s. 6d.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.
STUDIES in POETRY and PHILOSOPHY.—Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keble. The moral motive Power. Second Edition, revised. In fscp. 8vo, 6s.

MR. MACDONELL.
A SURVEY of POLITICAL ECONOMY. In crown 8vo, 6s. By JOHN MACDONELL.

DR. HANNA.
THE WARS of the HUGUENOTS. By WILLIAM HANNA, D.D. Fscp. 8vo, 5s.

MR. GEMMEL.
THE GOSPEL in ISAIAH: Being an Exposition of the 55th and 56th Chapters of the Book of his Prophecies. By JOHN GEMMEL, M.A., Fairlie. Fscp. 8vo, price 5s.

PROFESSOR BLACKIE.
FOUR PHASES of MORALS—Socrates, Aristotle, Christianity, and Utilitarianism. By J. STUART BLACKIE, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. In 1 vol., fscp. 8vo, 6s.

EDMONSTON and DOUGLAS, Edinburgh, and all Booksellers.

Published by ARTHUR MIALL, at No. 18, Bouverie Street London; and Printed by ROBERT KINGSTON BURT, Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London.—Thursday, July 4, 1872.